UTRUM HORUM?

SECOND EDITION.

[Price Two Shillings.]

LATIN HONOURS

SECOND EDITION.

I.

Utrum Horum?

THE

GOVERNMENT;

OR, THE

COUNTRY?

BY D. O'BRYEN.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. DEBRETT, OPPOSITE BURLINGTON HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

1796.

BODLEIAN
20 MAR 1940
LIBRARY

UTRUM HORUM?

The GOVERNMENT; or, The COUNTRY?

BEFORE I endeavour to ſhew that the Empire has no choice between the alternatives which form the title of this pamphlet, I am willing to guard againſt a miſtake.

If the word Government ſhould, by an abuſive conſtruction of the term, be ſuppoſed to comprehend the King's authority—if it was underſtood to involve the other eſtates which compoſe the frame of this conſtitution,—and that their civil extinction were become abſolutely indiſpenſible to the ſalvation of the country;—even in this ſhocking dilemma, though it might be painful to act, it could not be difficult to decide. King, Lords, and Commons, every particle of whoſe ſeveral authorities are public truſts for public purpoſes, what are they when ſet in compariſon with the public ſafety? If it were clear that their civil functions were in-

compatible with the national exiſtence and moral happineſs of the people, what heſitation could a man, born under, and bred in, the principles of the Britiſh Conſtitution, have in ſuch an extremity to proclaim,—periſh a thouſand governments, live the country!!!

But far from us—far for ever be it ſo—is ſuch a ſituation!

The ſenſe in which I uſe the word government is its vulgar and popular ſenſe. I do not mean the conſtitution or any eſtate of it. The conſtitution of England is an object of my ſincere admiration. It is ſo; not becauſe Mr. Burke (whom I name with reverence and muſt ever regard with affection) not becauſe he tells me that the people of England are the *property* of King George the Third, as the ſucceſſor of King William. I ſhould loath a ſyſtem that transferred a nation like a herd of ſwine in ſuch a manner. Not becauſe Mr. Dundas tells me in a barbarous jargon, well ſuited to his logic, that the man can have no love for the Engliſh conſtitution "who thinks it poſſible for "any form of government to be ſo good;" a dictum ſo preſumptuous, as to find excuſe only in the arrogant ignorance of the perſon who thus circumſcribes the immortal intellect of man to the perfection, whatever it is, of the ſyſtem under which *he* feeds and fattens—a ſyſtem which is only degraded by ſo ſuſpicious a teſtimonial, and whoſe juſt claim to the attachment of reaſonable men is

founded

founded upon a baſis very different indeed from ſuch hyperbolical abſurdity. Nor is my admiration of the Engliſh conſtitution becauſe Mr. Payne wildly tells me it is a non-entity, and triumphantly challenges to point it out, if we have a conſtitution.

I am far from thinking that the Britiſh conſtitution is generally underſtood; but without referring Mr. Payne to this page or to that book for it, no man need be at a loſs where to find the Engliſh conſtitution. It is to be found in the known principles of Britiſh freedom, of repreſentative legiſlation, of executive reſponſibility, and ſtill more diſtinctly in the principles of its juriſprudence. The common law of England, and the maxims of our judicial code form, in deſpite of many frauds in the practice, and of ſome proviſions which are a diſgrace to the ſtatute book; in deſpite of the ſtudied obſcurity of lawyers, and the frequent ſervility of judges—the moſt perfect juridical ſyſtem with which the civilized world has ever been acquainted. The moſt wholeſome praiſe of the Britiſh conſtitution is, that it has produced more political happineſs than any other. Of the American conſtitution the experience is ſhort. The experience of the French is nothing. It is poſſible indeed that the Science of Government may be ſtill in its infancy. A few years have undoubtedly produced the moſt ſtupendous events amongſt nations. The worſt part of the new ſyſ-

tems *may* become better than the beſt of the old. I ſtand however upon the ſureſt of all baſes, the baſe of practice, in preferring the Britiſh conſtitution for the Britiſh nation, conſcious at the ſame time of many defects, and in the full ſunſhine of conviction upon this point—that the preſent government have bereaved the people of its vital parts.

This preference of mine neither inſults the labours of other nations, nor excludes the poſſible ſuperiority of other ſyſtems. I ſhall demonſtrate before the end of this work how much it is my wiſh that the only rivalry among ſtates may be a rivalry of happineſs and a competition in the arts of peace. But with our preſent limited knowledge; under all the wiſdom and all the ignorance of our ſocial condition at this time of the world, there is neither offence nor extravagance in being content with the true conſtitution of England, adminiſtered according to its genuine principles that is to ſay—univerſally and ſtrictly for the public good—one of my objects in this publication being to vindicate and recover that conſtitution.

Of that conſtitution it is a wiſe maxim that the King can do no wrong—but in ſecuring the perſonal impunity of the firſt magiſtrate it aſſerts the reſponſibility of his agents. By the word government I mean only thoſe agents. None but a traitor to the King—none but an enemy to his family will blend his perſon, or mix his fate with the fate of his miniſters. I ſhall be guilty of no

ſuch

ſuch act. I ſhall ſeparate the royal authority from the crimes of the government—and, without once touching even the exterior of the conſtitution, I ſhall ſtrive to convince my reader, as I am convinced myſelf, that the ſalvation of the Empire calls for the overthrow of the adminiſtration—and that its future ſecurity demands the puniſhment of the principals!

THE ARGUMENT OF THIS PAMPHLET IS DIRECTED TO THREE POINTS.

The firſt, to ſhew, *that the duration of the war is ruin, and that peace alone can ſave us.*—The ſecond—that, *the beſt peace which can be rationally expected from the preſent miniſtry, would be a greater calamity then even a continuance of the war.*—The third—that *the true policy and beſt hope of the country will be firſt in a grand act of* JUSTICE—*and finally in a* COURAGE *worthy of its antient character.*

THE

THE DISTRIBUTION IS UNDER THE FOLLOWING HEADS.

That the duration of the war is ruin and that peace alone can ſave us, - *page* 7

Conduct of the Britiſh government towards the French revolution, - - *page* 13

The ſame ſubject continued, *page* 32

Effect of the miniſter's ſyſtem upon France, *page* 56

Effect of the ſame upon England, *page* 64

Incapacity of the preſent miniſtry to make a real peace, - - *page* 72

Is a real peace probable from a change of ſyſtem and new miniſters? - - *page* 96

General obſervations, - - *page* 105

Concluſion, - - *page* 120

THAT

THAT THE DURATION OF THE WAR IS RUIN; AND THAT PEACE ALONE CAN SAVE US is a propoſition that, in the preſent ſtate of this country, proves itſelf. Future ages will ſcarcely credit the groſs impoſitions that have been paſſed upon the people by the authors of the war. It is not a wiſe nation, but a frantic gladiator, that can be reconciled to ruin by the deſtruction of an adverſary. Yet, ſtrictly in the ſpirit of this gladiator have the people of England ſtruggled for the laſt four years.—I think I know Mr. Pitt as well as he knows his auditory, and, extravagant as the ſpeculation ſeems, I proteſt I do not deſpair of hearing him once again and for the fifth year, drug the poſſets of his ſupporters, as wiſe as they are upright, with one more draught of French finance. Be it known then to all men that this miniſter in drawing the intereſt of a hundred millions of money from the people of England, has uniformly given the houſe of Commons the pious and moral ſatisfaction, that France was *undone*, regularly undone upon each ſucceſſive loan! *And they believed him.*

That virtuous houſe believed him. His information was ſo correct, his calculations ſo exact —He might have paſſed for chancellor of the exchequer to the committee of public ſafety in the years 93 and 94—or miniſter of contributions

to

to the directory in 95 and 96, ſo detailed was his knowledge of the immediate ruin of France from the ſtate of her credit.

A member of the houſe of Commons whoſe object is not the ruin of France, but the ſafety of England, expreſſed himſelf thus upon the very firſt diſplay by the miniſter of this poſitive deſtruction of France from the ſtate of her finances. "That the credit of France is low, her expences "great, and her reſources much exhauſted cannot "be denied;—but if I believed the reſult drawn "by the Engliſh miniſter from her ſituation, I "ſhould not be the more reconciled to this war. "What is it to me that France ſhould be undone, "if England is undone at the ſame time? Every "word I now hear about French aſſignats, I "heard of American aſſignats eighteen years "ago.—We know the conſequence. For any "thing I know France may go on ruining at this "rate for ten years to come, and what will then be "the ſituation of England?"

Thus ſpoke a man whoſe warnings appear to have ſomething like the fate of Caſſandra's. She was always right; but the Trojans could never ſee the truth of her predictions, until they read them diſtinctly by the light of the Trojan conflagrations.

Theſe warnings however had no effect upon the houſe of Commons. That aſſembly took the flattering unction to their ſouls, and believed all they were told.—Like the caſuiſt who upon being

being queſtioned whether he had ſworn the thirty-nine articles, anſwered that he had, and was only ſorry there were not as many more to ſwear, that he might the better prove his orthodoxy. The houſe of Commons believed every ſyllable the miniſter uttered, and would have believed thirty-nine times as much from the ſame lips, *to prove their orthodoxy.*

Mr. Pitt aſſured them in the year 93 that the ruin of France was quite certain. It was quite certain alſo in 94—of courſe it was not the leſs certain in 95;—but upon the very laſt day the houſe of Commons ſat on national affairs, in the month of May 96, the thing was put out of all queſtion. One clear hour and a half of moſt beautiful eloquence was employed by that gentleman upon French finance—and he honeſtly and fairly, " both as a man and a miniſter" convinced his hearers that the exploſion was on *the point* of breaking, which would reduce the enemy to " that " chaſm in Europe which once was France"—

The ruin of France was ſo certain at all theſe periods that doubt of it became a conſtructive treaſon. The houſe of Commons waited, and waited, and waited, for the promiſe of the Oracle—until ruined France has brought Europe at her feet, and mankind looked about them aghaſt and aſtoniſhed!

Maracci in his hiſtory of Mahomet ſays that Mahomet having promiſed his followers, that

he ſhould riſe in three days after his death; they waited round his body in expectation of his reſurrection, until they were nearly ſuffocated by the ſtench from the rotten carcaſe of the dead impoſtor. Not ſo the diſciples of Mr. Pitt. In ſober certainty of their living prophet, and fumigated by the fragrance of all his places, they ſtill look no doubt to the full accompliſhment of their idol's vaticination. I crave the reader's mercy, when I propound it as a ſpeculation perfectly conſiſtent with the characters of the miniſter and of his parliament, for *him* to feaſt them again with one more banquet upon French ruin, and for *them* again to devour and digeſt it. We ſhall ſee.

HOWEVER, the comparative ruin of the two countries is not the preſent point. We *believe* the diſtreſs of France to be great, we *know* our own to be ſo. Crowned with a glory beyond any thing Greek or Roman, they have more to ſhew for their expenditure, than ever nation had before. We have no levies to look for beyond the bounds of this iſland. No ranſom is to reach our coffers, no trophy of fame, no monument of art to illuſtrate our triumphs! No king of Sardinia, no king of Naples, no pope of Rome, no duke of Modena, no German circles, no cities, free or enſlaved, are to contribute one ſhilling to our

" indemnity

" indemnity for the paſt." Without inquiring the value of the vaſt acquiſitions of France, it is certain that a ſingle Flemiſh province is of more conſequence than our conqueſts in the Weſt Indies. Of thoſe in the Eaſt, we have the recorded opinions of the preſent miniſtry, confirmed by the voices of the houſe of Commons, that extenſion of territory in that quarter of the globe is miſchievous to our intereſts. If, however, the whole country on the left of the Rhine was not worth one ſhilling to France, it makes nothing againſt my argument.

Without dwelling upon the depreſſion of our funds, or upon the known cauſes that prevented their ſinking ſooner—Without dwelling upon a loan of twenty-five millions and a half in one year (with every ſervice of the ſtate enormouſly in debt at the ſame time)—Without dwelling upon this dreadful calculation; that if the war were to ceaſe to-morrow, near THREE MILLIONS more of annual taxes muſt be drawn from the labour and comforts of the people of England to ſupply defalcations, and to pay the intereſt of debts already incurred. (Some judicious gentleman will perhaps tell me that I am " wrong by four ſhillings and ſixpence " halfpenny," to repeat the phraſe of a noble Marquis. Be it ſo. I am content to be miſtaken in the ſum total.)

—Without dwelling upon the loſs to the commerce of this country of the markets of France,

of Spain, of Holland, of the Levant, and the Mediterranean—without dwelling upon the alarming emigrations to America (emigrations provoked by an execrable policy, which will ſoon be its own puniſhment)—It is not upon any ſingle grievance, but *upon the whole ſtate* of the Empire, my concluſion is founded—"That the duration of the "war is ruin; and that peace alone can ſave us."

As this propoſition is almoſt univerſally admitted, I ſhall proceed to the grand principle of my argument. I have put this in ſtrong terms—and reaſſert what I think I ſhall prove, that, with all the obvious ruin of this war; that even under the crying neceſſity for peace, ſo generally proclaimed as our only ſource of ſafety; yet—"that "the beſt peace which can with reaſon be expected "from the preſent miniſtry, would be a greater "calamity than even a continuance of the war."

CONDUCT OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT TOWARDS THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

THE following axioms appear to me to be irreſiſtible.

That the Engliſh government had but one of two courſes to purſue upon the great event of the French revolution:—either to oppoſe the freedom of France in the outſet with all its might, or to encourage it with cordiality.

And *that even a faithful neutrality would have been only negative wiſdom—but that a treacherous neutrality was the moſt deſtructive policy our government could poſſibly adopt.*

In oppoſing the freedom of France, the Engliſh government might reaſon in this manner.

It is true the old deſpotiſm of France, which brought down England ſo low, has been overthrown by the people of France! It is true the national aſſembly has diſclaimed all wars of conqueſt, and that the French people diſcover good ſympathies towards the people of England. But nevertheleſs the liberty of free France may in the end prove more fatal to England, than even the ambition

ambition of the grand monarchy. The ſtout reſiſtance of England to that ambition was the effect of its free conſtitution—and if France, to all her phyſical ſuperioritics, ſuperadd the advantage of a conſtitution perhaps more free than our own, then free England can have but a ſlender chance againſt freer France, in proceſs of time. Pretexts for quarrelling can never be wanting. Succeſs and power may evade or diſown what at beſt is but a declaration of the conſtituent aſſembly. War, with all its calamities, is preferable to national extinction. We will even take our chance with the old tyranny of France, and cruſh, if we can, her new-born freedom.

I am afraid there are many men in England—many too who never read a line of Machiavel, to whom this ſtile of reaſoning, odious and deteſtable as it is, would have been very palatable. Promiſing however as ſuch a ſpeculation may be to bad men, it did not ſeduce our virtuous miniſtry. They reflected perhaps that ſuch very daring wickedneſs might revolt the hearts of all honeſt men in England.—We have the public declaration of my Lord Hawkeſbury himſelf, that if the Engliſh miniſtry had reſiſted the French revolution in its outſet "he ſhould not have been the laſt "man to condemn them." The Engliſh miniſtry acted no ſuch vile part, not they—yet even this part, iniquitous as it would have been, is the perfection

ſection of policy, in compariſon with the courſe which they took.

It is not neceſſary to enlarge upon the effects of the ſyſtematic hoſtility of the houſe of Bourbon to this country. From the Duke of Norfolk at the head of the peerage, to the beggar in the ſtreet, there is not a citizen of this country who has not in ſome ſhape a daily experience of its fatal conſequences. It takes from the enjoyments of the rich, and leſſens the comforts of the poor, every day of the year. The mouth cannot be fed, nor the back cloathed, without bearing teſtimony to the ambition of the houſe of Bourbon; and ſuch is the fecundity of exaction in England, that we are obliged to pay taxes for even the light of Heaven, as we ſhortly muſt, I fear, for exiſtence itſelf.

All this is the gift of the houſe of Bourbon. The Engliſh nation thought fit about a century ago, to alter its ſyſtem of government. The tyrant king of France ſaid England ſhould not do ſo, and to prevent the ſucceſs of our revolution, went to war with us. Until the reign of this prince the French government had not become thoroughly tyrannical. Under him and forth from his time, it became the moſt ſettled deſpotiſm in the world. Waging frequent war againſt France for many centuries before, no permanent evils remained upon England after ſuch a ſeries of hoſtility, until every trace of liberty in France had

at length merged in the boundleſs authority of Lewis the 14th. From that hour the laſting miſfortunes of this country commenced.

The national debt of England at the period of the Engliſh revolution was about a ſingle million. The tyrant king of France in the endeavour to overſet that revolution made that national debt near fifty millions; and before the ſucceſſor of this monarch deſiſted from forcing upon us a prince and a government both of his own choice, our debt became near a hundred millions. His ſecond ſucceſſor, the late unhappy king, beſides tearing from us one of the faireſt empires in the world, raiſed our debt to near three hundred millions. Thus by the politics of the three laſt French princes, our debt from one million became near three hundred millions!

Prone as this country has been to differ upon public topics, there never was but one opinion upon the cauſe of theſe five wars. We never allow any doubt of their originating in "the reſtleſs ambition of the Moſt Chriſtian King." A phraſe which appears in every Engliſh manifeſto for the laſt hundred years.

In this country we have had plagues, famines, invaſions, rebellions.—England has ſurvived them all. It has conquered all ſorts of calamities except the gift of the houſe of Bourbon. That incurable ſchirr, growing into our very vitals, baffles all remedy, and preſents nothing before us but a deadly deſpair.

deſpair. Other grievances are complex—but the fatality of the national debt of England is ſenſible both to the " feeling and the ſight" of the moſt ſtupid creature in the community. An exact computation cannot perhaps eaſily be made of the ſums paid by each individual in exciſes and cuſtoms; but the dulleſt being can comprehend this—that the intereſt of the national debt, was nearly one half of the rated currency of England before the commencement of the preſent war.

Had " the reſtleſs ambition of the houſe of " Bourbon," not harneſſed England to ſuch a load as this, what might not be the proſperity of a country of eight millions of inhabitants—if freed from an annual taxation of near ten millions ſterling to pay the bare intereſt of this legacy of the houſe of Bourbon!!!

Such was our ſituation before the preſent war. If inſtead of being hiſtory, it had been a ſubject of ſpeculation, to fancy what deſcription of Engliſhmen would have rejoiced the moſt in the French revolution, it ſurely would be thought that a *miniſter* would rejoice before all men—and before all miniſters, *Mr. Pitt!*

This miniſter after ten years of peace, ſtanding upon vantage ground never occupied by any former adminiſtration, with the hands of this recreant houſe of Bourbon, in a manner tied behind its back during the whole ten years.—This miniſter, compleatly upon velvet with regard to foreign

affairs; backed by unprecedented majorities both in and out of parliament, and never denied a ſhilling of impoſt in a country too, flouriſhing in trade, according to his own account, beyond all former examples.—What then was the atchievement of this miniſter after ten ſuch years of peace?—He equalized the income of the country with its expence, and contended that he had a million of ſuperflux to redeem capital!!

The reality of this ſuperflux has been a point of diſpute between the ableſt men in England. We ſhall however take Mr. Pitt's word, that in the laſt year of peace it was real and efficient. That it had no exiſtence during the firſt four years of his pretended reduction of debt, has been proved to demonſtration. It is not my immediate purpoſe to throw any blame for the non-entity of this ſuppoſed ſuperflux. It became a poſitive exceſs of income as ſoon perhaps as the miniſter, without grinding the country, could make it—but if this million of ſuperflux was the *utmoſt produce of ten ſuch years of peace*, what in the name of heaven did this very miniſter think would be the condition of his country after ten years, or half ten years, of war?

This is the place to aſk myſelf a very neceſſary queſtion—Did the French revolution ſo entirely "neutralize and dulcify" the people of France towards the people of England, as to juſtify our diſcarding at once the old antigallican ſyſtem?

Were

Were the principles of Sir William Temple, of Lord Godolphin, of the late Lord Chatham, and the preſent Mr. Fox—indeed of all the great ſtateſmen of the preſent century;* were theſe principles grown ſo obſolete, that all dread of French aggrandiſement was to be effaced from our breaſts as a neceſſary conſequence of the French revolution? This queſtion would not come amiſs from a ſtranger; for in truth it would be difficult to find a greater zealot in antigallican policy, or who expreſſed his opinion with more plainneſs upon that point, than

* Of all the public men in our time no one has ſhewn ſuch indifference to thoſe maxims of famous policy as the preſent Mr. Pitt. Throughout the whole buſineſs of Lord Auckland's treaty, this policy was ſlighted by him in a very notable manner. The only trace of it to be found in his conduct is upon an occaſion where he miſapplied and diſgraced it: namely the affair of Holland in the year 87. It was not reſcuing Holland from France upon the principles of the triple league, but enſlaving the Dutch nation by the bayonets of Pruſſian grenadiers, in the true ſpirit of the Pilnitz conſpiracy. Such a total want of judgment diſfigured the whole of that tranſaction—the people of that country were treated, upon that occaſion, with ſuch an unſcrupulous tyranny as might well have prepared men of common ſenſe on our ſide of the water for that quick deſtruction of the Stadtholder's power and the determined dereliction of all connection with England which took place upon the firſt opportunity.—And yet the Engliſh army was quite ſurpriſed at the uſage they lately met with in Holland!!

even the humble author of this pamphlet. In a tract relating chiefly to French affairs publiſhed by me in the year 86 is the following ſentiment.* "It is the duty of Great Britain to "conſider any acceſſion of ſtrength or territory "which France may obtain in any part of the "world, as ſo much taken from her own power; "—and to view any abaſement of French great-"neſs, or diminution of French empire, as ſo "much gained to herſelf."

With ſuch ſentiments upon the general policy of England to France, can it be the opinion of the author of the paſſage juſt quoted, that the French revolution *ſhould have* annihilated all national jealouſy of the power of France in the people of this country *ipſo facto*?

Without anſwering this queſtion in the affirmative *to the extent of it*; I have no doubt at all that it was the true policy of England to act upon the hypotheſis of *the French revolution having radically changed the relation of the two countries, and of having placed both in an order of things new, and mutually auſpicious.*

Aſſuming, for much more than the mere purpoſe of my argument, that the ſenſe of mankind would have ſcouted the Engliſh miniſtry if they had adopted the crooked courſe of reſiſting the at-

* View of the Treaty negotiated by Mr. Eden—Debrett.

tempt

tempt of France to make herſelf free, in the outſet of the revolution, then it follows that their ſoundeſt wiſdom was to manifeſt their complacency towards it.

Of all the misfortunes that can befal this country, the firſt and greateſt, beyond all queſtion, is to be the ſettled opponent of *free France*. If France had not gained one victory in the courſe of the preſent war, and but barely retained her antient territory; ſtill the blackeſt enemy of the Engliſh nation could never wiſh it a deſtiny more fatal, than that another Rome and Carthage ſhould be revived in the two *free* empires of France and England!

Memorable enough for this country is the effect of only the "reſtleſs ambition of the houſe "of Bourbon"—but no imagination can contemplate without horror the probable conſequence of the genius of that houſe being transfuſed into the maſs of the French nation. It is this very thought which would have been uppermoſt in the mind of a wiſe Britiſh government, upon the breaking out of the French revolution. With all the atrocity of the attempt, they ſhould on the inſtant have taken Lewis the Sixteenth by the hand, and ſtrangled the revolution in its birth, or have made a virtue of neceſſity and cordially encouraged it—a courſe which in no degree involved any interference in its domeſtic progreſs.

Without detailing the natural ſtrength of France,

France, her ſituation in the midſt of Europe, the compactneſs of her territory, the fertility of her ſoil, her vaſt population— France in able management muſt always be an overmatch for any competition in Europe. The ſame ſuperiority which marked the territory called France, in the hands of Cæſar and Conſtantine, of Charlemagne and Lewis the Fourteenth, muſt diſtinguiſh it in an equal degree, whenever its powers are wielded with equal ſkill.

Placed upon the globe as France and England are :— With ſuch a community of intereſts in all ſeas and regions, ſuch a rivalry in arts and manufactures, the baſe ſpirit of trade itſelf, whoſe very genius is monopoly—all theſe circumſtances would of their own natural operation have required the moſt delicate vigilance of the moſt benevolent policy in both countries, to ſmooth and harmonize their mutual intereſts. But if *delenda eſt Carthago* is really the creed of either nation, then has this country yet to witneſs calamities, compared with which all its paſt diſaſters are the peace and tranquility of the garden of Eden!

Between the beginning of the firſt and the fatal termination of the third Punic war, about half the time was conſumed in mutual ſlaughter— and though the events are nineteen hundred years old, the dreadful narrative of five and forty years inhuman warfare, fills the ſoul with terror even at this diſtance of time. But all this is nothing to the

the fate of France and England, ſhould a helliſh policy plant an incuráble hatred between two ſuch nations. The firſt duty then of a wiſe Britiſh adminiſtration ſhould have been to eradicate, as much as poſſible, the ſeeds and ſources of all national antipathy upon the dawn of that French freedom which they had determined not to oppoſe: —but to excite national antipathy *by choice*, is indeed an inſanity that will ſcarcely be credited in after times!

Who can forget the grand and glowing picture drawn by this very Mr. Pitt, upon the diſcuſſion of Lord Auckland's treaty, of the better proſpects of France and England for evermore. "Articled "partner" though France became by that treaty, to repeat the words of Mr. Burke, in the grand arcana of Britiſh commercial ſuperiority, Mr. Pitt, in the fineſt ſtrains of pathos and prophecy, deſigned the two ſtates in future for nobler purpoſes than mutual butchery. But the moment the deſpotiſm (ſo deſtructive at all times to the intereſt of England) with which he had negotiated that treaty had been demoliſhed by the heroic ſpirit of the French; then all his golden expectations vaniſhed in a moment! The pernicious tyranny of the houſe of Bourbon beamed, according to this miniſter every thing that was auſpicious upon the new connection of the two countries, but as ſoon as freedom and philoſophy exalted that people of ſlaves into a nation of men—*that inſtant*, the government

vernment of England ſaw nothing but plague and peſtilence in the intercourſe of the two ſtates.

If ever the hour of account ſhould come in this country, the accuſer knows nothing of the crimes of the miniſtry who does not begin his indictment with the beginning of the French revolution.

It is notoriouſly certain that this revolution was, at its commencement, a popular event in England. It was ſo in part from a ſympathy to the cauſe of freedom, but in a much greater degree from conſiderations ſtrictly Engliſh, and a belief that the downfall of the Bourbon tyranny was a preſage of long bleſſings to the Engliſh nation. Yet coeval with the firſt free ſentiment that was uttered in the conſtituent aſſembly, was the actual enmity of the Engliſh government to the French revolution.

The Engliſh government had ſhewn its teeth long before any diſapprobation had yet proceeded from the early, the late, and the immortal enemy of that revolution, Mr. Burke himſelf!

The firſt pamphlet of this celebrated perſon upon the French revolution, was read by the author of theſe ſheets as ſoon, I believe, as by any man, at this time, in the land of the living. Flattered and honoured by its illuſtrious writer, I felt more true pride in his kindneſs and condeſcenſion, than from any favours that could be conferred by any of the tyrants whoſe cauſe he has ſince pleaded

with

with ſuch unrivalled eloquence. Though it fell within my knowledge, by having ſeen the manuſcript of that memorable work many months before its publication, and by various converſations with him, that Mr. Burke was hoſtile to the French revolution, yet the public were ignorant of his ſentiments, until the *fracas* with Mr. Sheridan* on the ſeventh of February 1790; long before which period, the Engliſh miniſtry had betrayed their hatred to the recent revolution. It is probable enough that the powers of ſuch a man as Mr. Burke may influence the opinion of the world more than the combined efforts of the adminiſtration—but it is againſt all reaſon that *they* ſhould take their cue from a gentleman, whoſe abaſement had been the labour of their lives; whoſe character and principles they had ſo long decried with enthuſiaſtic rancour.

Though the miniſtry were rejoiced no doubt at ſuch an ally againſt the French revolution, the

* It appeared to the author of this pamphlet, that the difference between theſe two great men would be a great evil to the country, and to their own party. Full of this perſuaſion he brought them both together the ſecond night after the original conteſt in the houſe of Commons; and carried them to Burlington houſe to Mr. Fox and the Duke of Portland, according to a previous arrangement. This interview, which, can never be forgotten by thoſe who were preſent, laſted from ten o'clock at night until three in the morning, and afforded a very remarkable diſplay of the extraordinary talents of the parties.

French nation had more deciſive intimations of their diſpoſition than in the eagerneſs with which they fomented the difference between Mr. Burke and his friends, (a conduct which their natural malice would have prompted) and more, even, than the encouragement which they gave to all that gentleman's indefatigable attacks upon the French. Every part of the revolution was odious in the eyes of Mr. Burke. Every part of Mr. Burke's former life was odious in the eyes of the Engliſh miniſtry. *He* looked aſkance at every thing that reſpected the French revolution. *They* ſurveyed him with a lover's fondneſs, and could diſcern no fault about him. From being the object of their maledictions he became a ſudden butt of their panegyric; and grew into their graces in exact proportion to the number and the vigour of his invectives againſt every thing that was French,—excepting its former tyrants and tyranny!

That houſe, the five hundred and fifty-eight members of which, (with the exception of very few indeed) will be no more known to have had an exiſtence than the cattle they drive, when Mr. Burke, notwithſtanding the diviſion and contradiction of his character, will be a ſubject of the admiration and the commentaries of mankind.—That houſe, which would ſhout him down to-morrow (if inſtead of publiſhing it, he were aſſerting his conſiſtency there, like the Earl of Fitzwilliam

in another place) for oppoſing a treaty, as loudly and clamorouſly, as the very ſame people extolled him four years ago, for ſaying that *any treaty* was ſtriking at the head of King George the Third—That honeſt impartial auditory, which would ſcarce grant him a hearing, when with all the ſplendor of his vaſt genius he defended the liberties of his country—hung with rapture upon his tongue and beatified his ſentiments—upon their finding, very unexpectedly, that he vindicated the deſpotiſm, and derided the free ſpirit of the French nation!

Mr. Burke however had not yet ſhewn his face in the houſe of commons before the temper of the Engliſh government towards the enfranchiſed people of France was pictured in the moſt legible impreſſions.

The deſtruction of the Byzantian library, the ravages of Italy by the Goths, the fall of Thebes or Athens, were never more deplored by the ſons of ſcience, than the French baſtille was "praiſed, wept and honoured" by the ſatellites of the miniſter on the meeting of parliament on the 21ſt of January 1790. The miniſter's own cautious ſilence was emphatically explained by the obloquies of Mr. Jenkinſon and Colonel Phipps, upon that memorable day, againſt the recent revolution.

Let it be obſerved that I am ſpeaking now, as theſe noble perſons were ſpeaking then, of the

French revolution long anterior to thoſe diabolical ſcenes which fill the world with ſuch juſt execration. No ſlaughter of priſoners at Paris or Verſailles,—no September maſſacres,—no bloody domination of Roberſpierre,—nothing of this kind had yet diſgraced the progreſs of the revolution. Yet the French troops, were arraigned and vilified by the friends of the Engliſh miniſter, upon debating the addreſs to the King on the day before named, for this conduct, which in their courtly judgments was a high crime—for refuſing to butcher the city of Paris on the murderous mandate of the Duke de Broglio.

But this ſhall paſs for nothing. I will even ſuppoſe that Lord Mulgrave and Lord Hawkeſbury, againſt whom I certainly have no perſonal ill will, delivered only their own, and not the miniſter's ſentiments upon this occaſion; ſtill the French were unfortunately at no loſs to underſtand the government of England by other organs.

There is not a man of buſineſs in France who does not underſtand the nature of the Engliſh preſs. From the month of May in the year 89 —that is to ſay as ſoon as principles of political liberty began to emanate from the conſtituent aſſembly, from that moment it became the diurnal taſk of every newſpaper under the influence of the Engliſh treaſury to abuſe the revolution, to pervert every good, to exaggerate every evil, to mutilate and miſrepreſent every fact,

fact, to traduce and outrage the whole French nation, in every ſentiment and operation.

We are now at war with France, and our objurgation of that country may find baſe precedents to juſtify the practice; yet if any one will take the trouble to look at the files of the court prints ſeven years ago in profound peace, thoſe prints will be found to maintain a valiant competition with the ſyſtematic calumny of the preſent moment.

I throw no blame upon the managers of theſe papers. When ſervility is the faſhion, it is very natural that its literary votaries ſhould ſupply the government with that kind of incenſe which it ſnuffs up with the greateſt ecſtacy. For ſome time this low cuſtom had been diſcontinued, but lately I perceive it is reſumed with very methodical rancour. And, as if the revolution had not teemed with facts enough, for ſuch a purpoſe; as if the real exceſſes that have notoriouſly been perpetrated in France, were not ſufficient to excite popular horror, fables are now invented, ſtory books ſearched and records of cruelty ranſacked, for curious crimes; and all regularly and daily charged upon the French.

The ſyſtem of ſcandal is indeed a cheap and ready inſtrument—but it is an inſtrument which no generous foe, either man or nation, will be anxious to employ. A nation is but an aggregate of individuals; and what brave man traduces his antagoniſt?

antagoniſt? Prepared if needful, to breaſt the ſteel or the lead of his enemy, ſuch a man has no faculty for ſlander. A better criterion of a truly noble nature cannot be than by an antipathy to this vile art. The preſent adminiſtration has not been ſuſpected of much petticoat influence; but from the habitual abuſe of the French, it looks as if the matrons of Billingſgate had changed places with the women, or the men-like women, at the head of our government.

I have no doubt there are gentlemen concerned in theſe prints, who love their country; and if a diſobedience to their patrons were not involved in the admonition, I would conjure them to abandon a practice in itſelf not more illiberal, than pernicious in its effects. Six and twenty millions of people ſeparated from us by a diſtance of only twenty-one miles, ſhould not be driven to ſwear like Hannibal at the altar. It is not with civil exceſſes alone they are inculpated; every deſcription of moral depravity is fancied and imputed every day to every part of France. To vilify the country in this manner would be only impolitic if the tales were true—but being falſe, even the peril of the thing is ſurpaſſed by its baſeneſs.

Exactly in the ſame way was America treated all through the laſt war;—and if thoſe miniſters, whoſe lofty contempt of the Americans was ſo admirably retorted upon themſelves, had been the negotiators with that country, God only knows where

where the misfortunes of this might have ended. We have the king's word at preſent for treating with France—but it is a diſmal augury of the ſucceſs of our negotiations, that we perſiſt in blackening and inſulting the power we cannot conquer.

The lower orders of the Engliſh have always been ſuppoſed to feel a ſort of natural hatred to the French, from which the higher were thought to be exempt. This diſpoſition ſeems in ſome degree to be now reverſed.—The Engliſh government, diſhonoured and beaten down by the arms of France, is inculcating this barbarous prejudice as a ſpecies of patriotiſm. The truth of the charge is undeniable, and the ſentiment is in exact keeping with their morality—for it is the characteriſtic of injuſtice never to forgive thoſe it has injured. Inſtead of cheriſhing this averſion, if they loved their country better than their places, they would ſtudy to extinguiſh it in both nations. All the ſucceſs and all the glory which wiſe ſtates can deſire, are perfectly compatible with the mutual amity of France and England;—but ſettled into a rooted rivalry, the globe is not big enough for their animoſity. Let the doctrines of the Engliſh miniſtry ſurvive the war, and though a peace were ſigned to-morrow, the temple of Janus will ſoon be opened again—opened perhaps, until one of the two is blotted out of the liſt of independent nations.

THE

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

To repeat one of my axioms—I ſay that the Engliſh government ſhould have made a virtue of neceſſity, and have "ſurveyed the revolution with "complacency;" conſidering that event as a mere ſubject of ſtrict ſpeculation:—but that it was doubly their duty to adopt this courſe, when, in truth, the firſt meaſures of emancipated France, confirmed it as the ſoundeſt practical wiſdom.

Aware of the ambitious intriguing nature of the Bourbon deſpotiſm—aware of the odium it entailed upon their country, the repreſentatives of the people of France, as the firſt fruit of their freedom, did ſolemnly proclaim in the face of the world as the fundamental principle of their new ſyſtem, "*never again to wage a war of* "*conqueſt!*"

Here was a declaration which, of all the governments of Europe, the Engliſh ſhould have accepted with moſt ecſtacy. This ſhould have been their policy, whether this grand maxim of the new order of things was true or falſe. If true, the peace of England, under wiſe counſels, was inſured by it; for the reſt of Europe united durſt

durſt not navigate a cutter againſt the wiſh of France and England. If falſe, the impoſture would be viſible to mankind, and could not fail to bring the deteſtation of all nations upon the new government, for ſuch conſummate hypocriſy. But let this declaration paſs, as a mere ſtring of words, too looſe and general to gull the crafty caution of our ſtateſmen! Preſently occurred an event, as if Providence had contrived it for the very purpoſe, of enabling the Engliſh miniſtry to try the ſincerity of the political philoſophy of France.

The reader remembers, indeed what Engliſhman can ever forget? the affair of Nootka Sound in the year 1790.

The king of France, whoſe cauſe has coſt this country in the laſt four years, ſo many thouſands of lives, ſo many millions of money, and more than ten thouſand millions worth of honour—the king of France, demonſtrating his hereditary hatred to England even in the laſt convulſions of his authority, would have fallen upon us at that moment,—*if he could.* Every body knows how the queen, and the Auſtrian cabal that ruled the French cabinet at that time, intrigued, in order to light up the flames of war between France and England upon that occaſion. The chief object of the French court was to ſtifle the revolution, under the pretence of ſupporting the family compact. I am ſpeaking of things capable of juridi-

cal proof. The king of France demanded twenty ſhips of the line, to ſupport his ally the king of Spain. The national aſſembly took the family compact into conſideration, and abrogated *the offenſive part of it*, making a general declaration of ſupporting Spain, if it appeared that ſhe was unjuſtly attacked; but ſeeing the country upon the eve of a war with the very power they had moſt cultivated throughout the revolution, that aſſembly cut up by the roots the cauſe of ſimilar danger for ever after. With a majeſty worthy of the vaſt empire they repreſented, and with a wiſdom never ſurpaſſed by any legiſlative body ſince the beginning of the world, they deprived the *man* of the dreadful power of involving the *million*, and rent from his hands for ever the *prerogative* of war!

It was in this memorable caſe of Nootka Sound, that the ſtupendous prerogative of *war* was taken from the king of France:—an act which was deemed by wiſe men at that moment, to have done more for the peace of Europe, than all the theories of philoſophers and all the labours of politicians, for centuries!

Of the further ſincerity of the French upon this grand point of never waging wars of *ambition*, there is no opportunity of judging, for they never had any fair play. The flagitious conſpiracy of Pilnitz brought the gang of tyrants upon them, and thoſe tyrants alone are anſwerable for the conſequences.

ſequences. It is frightful, without doubt, to ſee the increaſed dominion of that ſtate; but if there be any juſtice under heaven, it is that France ſhould exact "indemnity" for the commiſſion, and "ſecurity" againſt the repetition of ſuch unmatched outrage!!

"Some ſtates are born to conqueſts, but France "has conqueſts thruſt upon her." After the poſſeſſion of Lombardy, it is notorious that General Buonaparte diſcouraged every diſpoſition of the natives to revolutionize the country, reſting in the expectation of propoſals for peace. His Italian territories were ſtill ſure to be reſtored to the Emperor, if the noxious influence of the Engliſh government had not perſuaded him to break the armiſtice upon the Rhine. Every previous ſtage of the war furniſhed a better opportunity for peace than the ſucceeding. Every delay became more and more deſtructive, and every delay was Britiſh. Britiſh influence ruined the King of Sardinia, the Italian ſtates, and the Stadtholder. By vomiting out the poiſon of Britiſh influence, Spain and Pruſſia have ſaved themſelves. The neutral ſtates were all bullied by the Engliſh government, to force them into the coalition;—but they braved the power which they muſt now deſpiſe; and by avoiding the infection of Britiſh politics, they have preſerved peace and happineſs. No comet carries in its tail ſuch ſure deſtruction, as the peſtilent principles of this adminiſtration.

I ſay then that the national aſſembly gave all the aſſurance which in the nature of things was poſſible for one country to give of its ſincerity to another. A ſolemn declaration confirmed by a poſitive act. Is it poſſible that this event could have paſſed without impreſſion upon the Engliſh miniſtry? That it produced no public teſtimony of their gladneſs or gratitude is quite certain. And whence this inſenſibility? To this queſtion the only anſwer can be conjecture. It looks as if the miniſtry balanced the buſineſs according to their own ſyſtem of computation. The event was an auſpice to Britiſh politics, but a ſad omen to the craft that deals in them. Perhaps the miniſtry imagined that they loſt more by the principle, than they gained by the point. One thing is certain, that all deſcriptions of corrupt men have been uniformly hoſtile to the French revolution, in common, unqueſtionably, with others upon whom no ſuch ſuſpicion can attach.—

From the firſt moment of that event, every thing was cold and diſtant from England. The French king between the commencement of the revolution, and his final overthrow, had two conſtitutional adminiſtrations. All his adminiſtrations were obliged to conform to the popular humour; —and the contraſt was curious between the frankneſs

neſs and conciliation of the French miniſters; the faſtidiouſneſs and repulſion of the Engliſh in their official commerce.

Every written document from the French government to this court up to the breaking out of the war, breathed nothing but good will, and an eagerneſs for the friendſhip of England; while an imperious air, a civility ungracious and almoſt inſulting, truly characterized the anſwers. The ſupercilious treatment of the French ambaſſador, the ſportive ſarcaſms, the gay ridicule of the Engliſh drawing room, that happy ſcene of wit! full rival to Marc Anthony's court at Athens! all theſe circumſtances were as well known at Paris as in London. It was the *haut ton* of the court to ſcandalize the revolution in every part of it. "They "ſcattered firebrands and ſaid 'twas in jeſt!"

This diſpoſition was manifeſt even upon the moſt trifling occaſions—not that the inſtance I am about to mention is ſo very trifling. The French nation altered the title of their firſt magiſtrate. They called him King of the French. Under this deſignation he proclaimed himſelf to all the courts of Europe, and in this name he was recognized by every neutral ſtate, except England. Lewis XIV. refuſed to name the Prince of Orange according to the title conferred upon him by the Engliſh revolution. For this refuſal England declared war, and forced the tyrant to acknowledge the title—but the Prince who now fills the throne

of

of England, in virtue of the Engliſh revolution, could not abide the revolutionary name of "King "of the French." The King of the French was only known to him by deeds of kindneſs and good neighbourhood, but the Moſt Chriſtian King tore America from his diadem and raiſed the national debt of his people to near three hundred millions ſterling.—By this loving name did his ſervants perſuade King George the Third to call Lewis XVI. to the laſt moment of his life, and *by no other*.

A conduct more ſerious and more deciſive in its relation to France is now at hand.

Whether the tenth of Auguſt 92 was a day of honour or of guilt for France is no Britiſh conſideration. Attempts have been made in this country to aſſimilate the tenth of Auguſt with the diabolical ſecond of September; although it is well known that the Gironde party, who gloried in the former, have loſt their lives upon the ſcaffold for endeavouring to puniſh the authors, and to vindicate France from the unperiſhable diſgrace of the latter tranſactions. But between theſe two events there is no ſimilitude, nor can any be imputed except by the moſt ſtupid prejudice or the moſt hopeleſs malignity.

In human crimes ſuch another inſtance of cruelty and cowardice cannot be found as the murders of September—while the page of hiſtory cannot ſhew a diſplay of heroiſm beyond the

reſiſtance

reſiſtance firſt made, and the final victory obtained, by the people over the Swiſs guards on the 10th of Auguſt.*

It is true that ſome ferocious wretches committed dreadful atrocities upon flying individuals at the cloſe of the ſcene on the 10th of Auguſt —but the real conquerors of the king's guards became their protectors upon ſubduing them, and with their own bodies covered the few that remained, into a place of ſafety, from the furies that ruſhed in when the battle was over. It is however indifferent to the preſent purpoſe what ſenſe may be entertained of the 10th of Auguſt,—but compaſſion and not argument is due to thoſe, if there be any, who think that France could ſurvive the war, if Lewis XVI. had managed it. That hell ſcroll, (which even its nominal author in his perſonal and political character has diſavowed) the manifeſto of the Duke of Brunſwick, told the French nation what they had to expect; and ſeparated the

* The firſt volley from the Swiſs guards covered the place de Carouzel with dead bodies—and it was over heaps of ſlain in the interior court, that the people entered the palace. Whoever has ſeen the ſpot can alone conceive the carnage of the citizens, mowed down from every door and window of that vaſt building, by the military. How very like this to the detailed butchery, one by one, of the unhappy priſoners in September?

court

court entirely from the people. The people then reſolved that the court ſhould not conduct the war,—and by that reſolution they ſaved their country.

" *At feſſi tandem cives infanda furentem*
" *Armati circumſiſtunt, ipſumque domumque,*
" *Obtruncant ſocios; ignem ad faſtigia jactant:*
" *Ergo omnis furiis ſurrexit Etruria juſtis:*
" *Regem ad ſupplicium præſenti marte repoſcunt.*"

(I do not wonder that the Engliſh miniſtry ſympathized with the French court upon the circumſtances that provoked the 10th of Auguſt. The principle that deprived the king of France of his crown upon that day was preciſely the principle of the Britiſh cabinet, throughout the whole of the famous conteſt between the Crown and the Commons in the year 84. The merits of either the India bill—or of the two decrees reſpecting the clergy and the formation of a camp near Paris, are foreign to the queſtion. The caſes were; that the ſecret adviſers of both princes counſelled their reſpective ſovereigns to ſtand upon the ground of ſtrict right—a memorable proof how compatible is a violation of the vital ſpirit of a conſtitution with a ſtrict adherence to its letter—and an exemplary inſtance of the madneſs of oppoſing prerogative to popular privilege in the exerciſe of any branch of royal authority ! !

We

We have no confidence in your miniſters ſaid the Engliſh houſe of Commons. The king of England *ſtood upon his right.* We demand your aſſent to theſe two decrees ſaid the legiſlative aſſembly. The king of France *ſtood upon his right.* All Paris went in proceſſion to the Thuilieries on the 20th of June to induce the court to yield to the aſſembly—the king *ſtood upon his right.* The commons of England went in formal cavalcade ſeveral times to St. James's imploring the king to liſten to their wiſhes. *The king ſtood upon his right.* The government of this country was degraded to a domeſtic concern, and the right contended, in *expreſs words*, of appointing or diſmiſſing a miniſter of ſtate, like a groom or butler. In France, even while the tenets of the demoliſhed deſpotiſm were ſtill freſh and reeking round the throne, no one ventured to *avow* ſuch a principle, though it was carried into actual effect. Both princes were guided by ſecret adviſers in contempt of their oſtenſible miniſters, and both diſmiſſed their reſpective adminiſtrations in pointed repugnance to the repreſentative body in both countries. Fox and the Duke of Portland were turned out here, Pitt and Lord Liverpool called in. Roland and Claviere were diſmiſſed and Breteuil and Deleſſart appointed there. In England the experiment ſucceeded—and the king is the idol of the people! In France it loſt the king his crown and finally his life!!)

Upon the whole a full conviction of the treaſon of the court produced the 10th of Auguſt. The king is depoſed, a convention called and the adminiſtration ſo lately diſmiſſed by the king, reappointed. That vaſt country as by electric impulſe reverberates one feeling. The Duke of Brunſwick, almoſt at the gates of Paris is chaſed out of the country, and forth from the moment of the king's overthrow, the ſucceſs and glory of the French arms are the wonder of the world. It is with truth then I ſay that pity alone is due to the man who doubts that the tenth of Auguſt ſaved France; yet upon this event it was that the Engliſh government recalled its ambaſſador.

I have ſaid that the merits of the tenth of Auguſt are excluſively a French conſideration; and the Engliſh miniſtry ſeemed in ſome degree to think ſo: for one of the reaſons they alledge for this extraordinary meaſure is to ſhew their neutrality! There was no countryman of mine in the cabinet, though they recal their ambaſſador *to ſhew their neutrality!*—The cloven foot however appears even in the ſame note of office, mixed with ſome more Iriſh reaſoning—they denounce France "with the indignation of Europe "in caſe any violence is offered to the King," at the very moment that *they* "*diſclaim all interference in its internal concerns.*"

The day Lord Gower was recalled from Paris, the Engliſh war began.

Never

Never ſhall I forget the words of Briſſot upon this occaſion. It happened to me to have been in Paris for a few days ſoon after the recal of Lord Gower, and to have dined ſometimes in this gentleman's company, who ſeemed a man of frank character, knew England and its language very well. He ſaid " he never deſpaired of the duration " of the peace with England until the recal of the " Engliſh ambaſſador. That the French were " well aware of the hoſtile diſpoſition of the " Engliſh miniſtry from the beginning of the re- " volution; they had hopes however that the un- " provoked injuſtice of ſuch a meaſure would pre- " vent the acceſſion of England to the coalition; " but the recal of the ambaſſador and ſending no " one to replace him, was too clear an explanation " of the Hanoverian miniſter's conduct at the diet " of Ratiſbon, who appeared more as a factor for " the Duke of Brunſwick's army, than the envoy " of a power, which had repeatedly promiſed its " neutrality!"

Indeed the impreſſion upon France of this meaſure of the Engliſh miniſtry was perfectly uniform.—Yet the French government was ſo anxious for peace with England, that they uſed all expedients to fix its neutrality. In the laſt official note to Lord Gower, the French counſel expreſs the utmoſt regret at his lordſhip's departure; and the famous declaration of the legiſlative aſſembly, juſt before its expiration, though addreſſed gene-

rally to Europe was in reality deſigned for England; in conſequence of the fears excited by the departure of the Engliſh embaſſy. A maſterpiece of Condorcet, publiſhed at the ſame time called "a "parallel between the French and Engliſh revolu- "tions," was directed entirely to this meaſure, and expoſed with incomparable reaſoning the notable diſpatch of Mr. Dundas to Lord Gower.

There is ſomething in the evidence of ſenſe more powerful than all the authorities in the world. If all the arguments upon the cauſe of the war were as much in favour of the Engliſh miniſtry, as they are deciſively againſt them, ſtill from what *I ſaw* in a few months ſojourning there in the year 92, I feel the moſt riveted conviction, that of all external advantages the French coveted moſt the friendſhip of England, and feared as the greateſt of all evils its hoſtility. To ſecure every attention and politeneſs at all hours and under all circumſtances it was ſufficient to be Engliſh. And their eagerneſs to conciliate England expoſed them even to deriſion. Nay the very pretext of the Engliſh miniſtry, the reception of ſome addreſſes from England by the convention, originated in the complaiſance of the French to every thing Engliſh. How came *that* to be a crime in 92, which paſſed without an obſervation during the three preceding years? Addreſſes from various parts of theſe three kingdoms had been repeatedly preſented for the firſt three years of the revolution

to

to the national aſſembly, without a murmur on the part of the Engliſh miniſtry or Lord Gower.

Why was the government ſilent upon the reſolution moved by Mr. Sheridan, and ſent to the national aſſembly in the year 90? Was it a terror that his high ſpirit would have compelled them to regorge their libels, if they ventured any againſt him, who never propounded a principle nor uttered a ſentiment upon public affairs that was not in the vital eſſence of the Engliſh conſtitution? If the act was wrong, ſo ſhining a man ſhould have been called to account for it. If right, its policy ſhould have been adopted, and good humour cultivated as a maxim of the government. —To their bitter coſt, they now know, that had they purſued the principle of that ſhort reſolution, the funds of this country had been now at par, five millions of annual taxes ſaved to the people, the ſlaughter of our countrymen and fellow creatures prevented, and England the moſt happy and flouriſhing region of the globe.*

The

* During the agitation of the Nootka Sound affair, when many of the beſt friends to the liberty and peace of England, dreaded a war with France from the intrigues of the French court, at a meeting of Weſtminſter electors, Mr. Sheridan was requeſted to propoſe a reſolution at a great aſſembly of the people, which was advertiſed for the 14th of July following. This reſolution, tranſmitted afterwards by the noble chairman, to the Duke of Rochefoucault, then preſident of the conſtituent

The guilt then of theſe addreſſes conſiſted in the *terms*. A reaſonable diſtinction I admit;—and far am I indeed from juſtifying all the ſtuff preſented to the convention in 92. But where was the Engliſh ambaſſador at ſuch a critical moment, whoſe lighteſt word muſt have ſtopt ſuch impertinence in the bud? *There* was the ſalient ſource of all the miſchief. It was not Lord Gower himſelf;—the meaneſt of his ſervants in the character of an envoy, muſt in one moment have put an end to theſe abſurdities.

—Well, but the contents of the addreſſes denoted their offence to the Engliſh government—*indeed!* Though the embaſſy was called away in the manner we have ſeen;—though the creatures of the Engliſh miniſtry were in the daily habit of inſulting the French nation; though the French were in total darkneſs how to ſquare their conduct to pleaſe the Engliſh miniſtry, who diſdained all communication with them: though the facility of acceſs to the bar of the French aſſemblies has expoſed them

tuent aſſembly, was ſuppoſed to have had a very happy effect at that very critical epoch.—and was in ſubſtance "an expreſſion of ſatisfaction at the amity and good will which appeared to pervade the French nation towards England; and a hope that nothing would interrupt the harmony which then ſubſiſted between them, ſo eſſential to the freedom and happineſs of both countries."

to

to volumes of ridicule; though hundreds of addreſſes were received and caſt aſide every day, like waſte paper, the Engliſh miniſtry, forſooth, expected that the convention with half Europe upon their backs and the poniards of Marat at their breaſts, would ſit down to analyze every addreſs whether in broken Engliſh, or barbarous French, that poured in upon them without mercy or meaning. !

What a reaſonable expectation!—If the reception of theſe perſons had been the moſt ſtudied offence to the Engliſh government; inſtead of being ſhadows that left no impreſſion and excited no regard, the Engliſh miniſtry are alone reſponſible. Had their ambaſſador been at his poſt in Paris, the firſt of theſe addreſſes muſt have been the laſt.

Never did man labour more to preſerve the peace of two countries, than Mr. Chauvelin;—but what ſucceſs could he have with men who were reſolved not to be ſatisfied? The conduct of Mr. Chauvelin and Lord Grenville in their epiſtolary intercourſe is an epitome of the two governments. On the one ſide appear an eagerneſs to know the grievance, and an anxiety to explain it. On the other a ſulky ſuppreſſion of the cauſe of complaint, and a moroſe booriſh predetermination not to be content. The one writes with a vivacity which is conſcious of no offence, and an impatience for ſhaking hands: the other with a churliſh

churliſh ſnarling growl, which fancies ſome intereſt in leaving the cauſe of diſpute ambiguous, and a clowniſh diſlike to any reconciliation. At length Mr. Chauvelin is turned out of the country, on account of an event, which, though calculated to move the ſorrow of every tender breaſt, was yet no object of cognizance for a Britiſh ſtateſman.

No ſtranger to the blood of the unhappy King of France could have lamented his fate more than the author of theſe ſheets—but I ſhall for ever deny that England had any pretence of right to revenge his death, or interfere in any ſhape in the domeſtic concerns of his country. The miniſtry diſmiſſed Mr. Chauvelin however immediately upon the king's death—which death, in my conſcience, I believe they haſtened and *wiſhed*.

In every view of their conduct upon this occaſion, this inference forces itſelf. They conſidered the French convention either as men of ſenſe and humanity;—as a band of blood thirſty ruffians, or as a mixture of both. Since the begining of the world there was never heard ſuch a torrent of abuſe as the miniſtry loaded France with from the beginning of the ſeſſions of Parliament on the 13th of December 1792 to the king's death on the 21ſt of January after. Could they think that *ſuch* a ſtile was the moſt likely to influence men of humanity and ſenſe, or that it was the beſt mode to mollify the tygers of September?

Survey

Survey the conduct of the Engliſh opposition upon this melancholy buſineſs.

A day was ſet apart on purpoſe in the houſe of Commons with a view to avert if poſſible the dreadful danger of this unhappy prince. Mr. Fox (followed in the ſame ſtile by all the leading men on that side of the houſe) gave reaſoned opinions, that it was for the honour and intereſt of France, to ſpare the king's life, expreſſing thoſe ſentiments with exquisite feeling, but with perfect moderation. If I had no perſonal knowledge of thoſe ſpeakers—If I did not well know how richly they are ſtored with the milk of human kindneſs, their conduct upon that day had left no doubt of their ardent wiſh to reſcue the unhappy victim—Mr. Pitt on the contrary vented himſelf againſt the convention and the country, in a ſtrain of the moſt loud, coarſe, ſcurrilous and vehement invective that tongue ever uttered.

Do I wrong the gentleman? My eyes ſaw him. My ears heard him, and my underſtanding put this queſtion. *Can this man be in earneſt to ſave the devoted King*? I believe he was quite in earneſt for his own purpoſe, namely, to whet the rancour of a goodly people, (who will I hope never ſhed the blood of man for evil ſpeculations) againſt France, which he had long meditated to attack, and of which meditation, the recal of Lord Gower was, as Briſsot asserted, but too deciſive an indication.

If the decree of fraternity had never iſsued from its tin brained* author. If no Engliſh addreſs had ever been received by the convention, the war was certain.

Who can forget the bugbear put forth in November 92? The parliament called in, the militia called out, the fortification of the tower of London, and all the other abſurdities played off at that juncture with ſo much effect, and ſuch contempt of truth and decency. The trading intereſt of London at Merchant Taylors Hall gives the miniſter a *carte blanche* in his military enterprizes. At that meeting were many perſons whom I ſincerely regard, but I ſhall for ever think they were a main engine in promoting the preſent war; and I know of no puniſhment now for their conduct, but that which appeared to be the proper remedy at the time—a ſtrait waiſtcoat.†

Calumny upon calumny, outrage, abuſe and imprecation were heaped together upon the

* Cambon has been twice trepanned.

† It is but candour to exculpate the majority of this meeting from any worſe imputation than error in judgment—but the promoters of it, and the agitators in it, thoſe miſchievous money jobbers, the ready inſtruments of every war-miniſter, who thrive upon the public calamity, and riot in the ruin they have themſelves conduced to bring upon the country.—Thoſe, indeed, deſerve no ſuch tenderneſs. There is no ſubject more worthy of a ſeparate and diſtinct diſcuſſion than the misfortunes entailed upon this country by the avarice and ſervility of this claſs of perſons.

French

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

French in one undiſtinguiſhed maſs. To treat with ſuch people " would be degrading the ho-
" nour of the country" ſaid the miniſter. " It
" is a direct blow at the head of the King of
" England" ſaid Mr. Burke. " Sooner than treat
" with them I had rather we were firſt beaten
" and have for our excuſe that we could not help
" it" ſaid Mr. Windham. (What think you now, Mr. Secretary at War?)—The man who ſtrove to ſtill this phrenzy; the man whoſe name would go with glory to after times, if all his public merits were confined to his opposition to this epidemical war, raiſed his voice againſt this miſchievous madneſs—and cried *negotiate!* " If all you ſay of
" France was true, ſtill *negot.ate.* You have no-
" thing to do with their conduct at home. If
" you fight on till the preſent generation is 'killed
" off,' you muſt in the end negotiate. Negotiate
" *now then* before you have loſt a life or riſked a
" ſhilling. After all this lofty imperious contempt
" you muſt come to negotiation in the end."

" ——— Tell her though ſhe paint an inch thick
" To this complexion ſhall ſhe come at laſt."

—It was all in vain; this very perſon, (almoſt in danger of being ſtoned in the ſtreets, for obſtructing the bleſſings of the preſent war, which was tobe the grand panacea for all diſtempers internal and foreign) was obliged to defend himſelf

" from the imputation of his virtues" in a printed addreſs to his conſtituents at Weſtminſter.

" Though all was then apocrypha—his wit,
" In time to come ſhall paſs for holy writ."

That pamphlet ſhould be chalked before the door of the miniſter, that a conſtant monument of his guilt might ſtare him in the face; for no evil has befallen his country, which that pamphlet and its author had not warned him of, in due time!

He did ſo, not from preſcience or preternatural gifts;—but becauſe the miniſter's proceedings being in direct repugnance to common ſenſe, all that has happened is the natural effect of ſuch conduct.

To this hour no human being can tell for what purpoſe we went to war at all. The queſtion has been aſked in ten thouſand ſhapes, and no intelligible object ever ſpecified. For myſelf I never was at a loſs for the true motive. The true motive I never doubted to have been a hatred to liberty, diſguiſed under the patronage of law, order, and religion; and that the multiplied embarraſsments of France at that moment, preſented a tempting hope of deſtroying it for ever.

Unlike the heroic war of William III. againſt a domineering tyrant, our William IV. aimed a blow with imagined ſecurity, in the true ſpirit of Glenalvon—in the ſpirit of a ſkulking coward who fell

fell on when his antagoniſt was ſtruck by another.

" The villain came behind her—but ſhe ſlew him."*

" INDEMNITY FOR THE PAST AND " SECURITY FOR THE FUTURE!"

This pithy ſentence is all that the Engliſh miniſtry ever eked out of their projects in this frantic enterprize. Before one hoſtile act took place, though preſsed in a thouſand modes to it, they diſdained to ſtate any grievance or define any redreſs, but whatever might be collected from theſe looſe words.

" INDEMNITY FOR THE PAST AND " SECURITY FOR THE FUTURE."

—O! fatal war creed of the Britiſh government. *They* to talk of " indemnity and ſe- " curity"—The raggedeſt knave without breeches, whom the French directory could pick up in the purlieus of St. Antoine, and dub with the name of a negotiator, would turn Lord Malmſbury, though ſtuck over with ſtars and ſtrings out of doors, if ſuch words were even glanced at as the preliminaries of peace!

What is now become of the famous and once faſhionable axiom, " that if the French emigrants " were not reſtored, Engliſhmen of property were " undone!?" Proſtrate before triumphant France

* Douglas.

our

our adminiſtration muſt drink ſuch bitter draughts of ſhame and ignominy as the inſulted government of that country ſhall in its diſcretion adminiſter to them. The former haughtineſs, oppreſſion and inſolence of the Engliſh miniſter will be ſtumbling-blocks at every progreſs he makes in negotiation. Mortification to himſelf and ruin to the nation meet him at every ſtep. He can neither carry on nor cloſe the war without danger to his country, nor make peace without diſgrace to himſelf!

In what a ſituation is this country placed?

Shall it be borne that the very miniſter who, *by only aſking for it*, had it in his power to keep France within her ancient limits without the loſs of one drop of blood, or one guinea—Holland ſafe, Germany ſafe, Italy ſafe. Good God! to what a pitch of baſeneſs is England brought, how totally extinct is all ſenſibility to national honour, if this very miniſter is to propoſe to a Britiſh houſe of Commons, after the waſte of a hundred millions of money and perhaps five hundred thouſand lives, to extend the French frontier from Dunkirk to Maeſtricht—from Landau to Duſſeldorf—from the Rhone to the Po; to ſtrip the emperor of the low countries; to exile and annihilate the unhappy ſtadtholder. —If all this *be* neceſsary as our peace-offering for national exiſtence, in the name of heaven, let us be ſaved from that laſt of infamies,—That

the

the very man who brought this ruin upon us, ſhould be the propoſer of its ratification!

The popular cauſes of the war then, it is evident were mere pretences. If a French corn-ſhip had never been ſeized in our ports—Had the French ambaſsador never been driven out of this country—ſtill the French government would have been juſtified in beginning hoſtility long, long before they actually did ſo.—But to reproach France with *commencing* the war from having firſt formally declared it, is quite deſpicable! It is like accusing a man of murder for ſhooting a robber who is pulling the trigger.

A drowning man will indeed catch at a ſtraw. Nothing, ſurely, but being overwhelmed and gaſping for life in the whirlpool, where they have ingulphed themſelves, could induce the Engliſh miniſtry to bring the iniquities of Roberſpierre in aid of their defence. The unfortunate deputies whom that human tyger devoured in Oct. 93, were ſometimes accuſed by their butchers, of declaring war againſt England. They were accuſed too of a design to put the crown of France upon the brows of the Duke of York;—of a plan to federalize the country; and to reſtore the Bourbons all in a breath:—in ſhort of every incongruous charge which infuriated tyranny could conjure up, to put a gloſs upon the murder of men, whoſe real crimes were their genius, their learning, and their desire to puniſh the perpetrators of the September

tember maſsacres. Yet, is the villainy of Roberſpierre often called by their abettors to the character of the Engliſh miniſtry: a teſtimony which is worthy of ſuch a cauſe!

" *Matre pulchra filia pulchrior!*"

EFFECT OF THE MINISTER'S SYSTEM UPON FRANCE.

The manœuvres which I have ſketched ſo ſlightly, have excited exactly ſuch feelings in the French nation as are appropriate to reaſonable and ſenſitive beings.

It is true, that voting a man " an enemy to " the human race" is mere nonſenſe as to the vote —but ſuch a fact declares the ſentiment that produced it, very forcibly. Besides considering Mr. Pitt as the ſyſtematic enemy of their liberties for three years,* before the war began, he is con-

* The friends of La Fayette in charging upon Mr. Pitt's intrigues the cruel captivity of that general, have accounted for it upon a principle of revenge. Mr. La Fayette, as they aſſert, had in his letters and converſations roundly accuſed the Engliſh miniſter of ſecretly thwarting the progreſs of the revolution, from its commencement.

feſsed to have been the recruiting ſerjeant of Europe againſt the French ever since he joined the coalition. There is not a neutral power which he has not attempted to beguile or threaten into the confederacy. To Mr. Pitt more than to all their other enemies combined, the French attribute every calamity they have ſuffered for the laſt four years. That war, which, by raging in the bowels of their country and ſhedding rivers of French blood by the hands of Frenchmen, they consider as the moſt inhuman of all the attacks made upon them, the war in the weſt—is imputed ſolely to the Engliſh miniſter.

—(O! that I had your powers, Mr. Burke! to invoke the indignation of God and man againſt the plotters of the Quiberon ſacrifice—where ſome of the braveſt ſpirits that ever animated the human form, were led like lambs to the ſlaughter, for Britiſh experiments.

And what is the excuſe?—that "many of the "emigrants thought the expedition to Quiberon "a proper meaſure."—Good God! and ſome of theſe very miniſters were miniſters alſo in the American war. *They* might well have remembered the misfortunes brought upon this country by the ſchemes of emigrants! The ſchemes of emigrants have ſometimes been found to originate in avarice, in ambition, in treaſon; but, if prompted by the moſt unſpotted virtue, what ſort of a go-

vernment is that, which will not ſtill the zeal of ſuch frantic projectors? The Biſhop of Dol's* famous paper, tranſmitted to France in this atrocious expedition, (many thouſand copies of which, printed in London, made a part of M. De Puiſaye's ammunition,) was ten thouſand times more abſurd than even the manifeſto of the Duke of Brunſwick; and indeed what other could befal ſuch an expedition, than its actual deſtiny?

* That modeſt veracious miniſter Lord Grenville, in the debate on the ſixth inſtant, denied the aſſertion of the late preſident of the council, that the Engliſh government contended for the reſtoration of monarchy in France. To ſay nothing of the proclamation at Toulon, what ſaid this paper which may be called the proclamation of M. de Puiſaye? He talked of nothing elſe but monarchy and of what ſort? Hear their own words. "Que le même que Dieu eſt independant, par lieu même & "par ſa nature, de même auſſi le Roi eſt independant a l'egard "de ſes ſujets & ſous les ordres de Dieu, qui ſeul peut lui de-"mander compte de l'uſage qu'il fait de ſon autorité"—to wit, "that as God is independent of himſelf and by his nature, ſo "is the King independent with reſpect to his ſubjects, and under "the commands of God, who alone can demand an account "of the uſe which he has made of his authority."

One more ſample of this Quiberon ſtate paper will ſatisfy the reader. Speaking of dead republicans it ſays. "Leurs "ames abominables ſont allés dans les enfers, etonner les "demons." "Their abominable ſouls are gone down to hell "to aſtoniſh the devil."!!

What ſay you John Bull? Is not your money well employed?

There

There is not a man of ſenſe in England out of the miniſterial pale, who did not think the ſcheme ſtark inſanity. Did M. Sombreuil think it "a good meaſure?" than whom a nobler victim has not been immolated all through this war. —His heart-ſtrings torn with love and terror for the dear one he had left in England; though De Puiſaye is the nominal object of his indignation—yet both his letters are a ſure demonſtration, that his feelings were common with thoſe of Charette; whoſe dying breath vented curſes upon the cabinet of England!)

The cabinet of England eſpecially the principal miniſter in it, is abſolutely loathſome to the French. Dearneſs of provisions, diſcredit of paper, forgery of aſſignats (a profligacy proved in a Britiſh court of juſtice), inſurrection, rebellion, every misfortune is imputed to Mr. Pitt. Whether each imputation is juſt, may not be eaſy to aſcertain, but the ſuſpicion is, unqueſtionably, a fair inference from his own principles. Far from any remorſe for fomenting the war in La Vendée, he aſsumes a merit from it. He "toſses "his dung with dignity," and calls exciting rebellion in that country "increasing the preſsure." Is the ſupposition far fetched, that a few thouſands may as well be ſported among the inſurgents at the camp of Grenelle, as hundreds of thouſands laviſhed and loſt for ever at Quiberon? Indeed without

corrupt influence the conduct of ſome of the French journals is utterly unaccountable.

Let us judge of Frenchmen by the rules of human nature.

What a hue and cry is heard at the ſurmiſe of French fraternization, or of any diſtinction being attempted between the Engliſh people and the government; but it appears a pious and moral ſyſtem to carry fire and ſword into the heart of France, and parcel out the country among our allies.—If any fair dealing is allowed in calculating the ſenſations of the French. If that univerſal maxim of "doing as we would be done unto" is not excluded by the barbariſm of our bigotry againſt that country. If we look at life, and draw our deductions from humanity, I aſk the reader, *what ſentiments he* ſhould entertain of ſuch a miniſter, or even of his country, if that country avowed him?

But as to the mere act of *treating*—the ready tranſmiſſion of the late paſsport was not neceſsary to inform any one, who considered the ſubject well, of their probable predilection. If the French really cheriſh a vital enmity againſt this country, of all the men in it, Mr. Pitt muſt be the individual they would wiſh, as being the beſt ſuited to their views. What deſcription of miniſter ſo likely to anſwer their purpoſe, as the very perſon who four years since would not breathe

the

the ſame atmoſphere with a French envoy—as the very perſon who would not diſhonour any Engliſhman with French negotiation; who ſo far from diſcuſſing conditions of peace, would not deſcend to aſk them even a queſtion—yet who has been ſo lately hunting about for a letter of recommendation, that he may to repeat his own ominous words, " lay England at their feet and ſupplicate " ſuch terms as their clemency may grant." *Tellephus et Peleus, &c.*

—Such a miniſter beaten and degraded, whoſe terſe ſhame at this moment can only be exceeded by his contemptuous ſeſquipedalities four years ago, is the very man they muſt prefer! The king —not the queen—of Spain had rather, I ſuppoſe, have parted with the Duke of Alcudia, than with St. Domingo; and not a doubt can be entertained, that a single word from France had bruſhed away the court minion; but of all the men from the Pyrenees to Gibraltar, *he* was the Spaniard for the French directory! The Duke of Alcudia made the war. The Duke of Alcudia makes the peace. Behold then a ſpectacle which ſpeaks the negotiator—the younger branch of the houſe of Bourbon uniting its forces with " the regicides" of the elder; and one half of Lewis XIV.'s poſterity exterminating the other half. If France be in reality implacable againſt England, of all living men Mr. Pitt is the perſon for their buſineſs; and I can ſafely foretell, that, after having

ving been their demon of diſcord through the war, he will aſſuredly turn out another *Prince of the Peace* to them, in the treaty!

But if the directory are in earneſt for a permanent pacification with the people of England—if their plan be not to wrap their wrongs from the Britiſh government in deep remembrance, *(alta mente repoſtum)* until their repaired reſources enable them to fall upon this country ſingle-handed —if a ſincere and cordial harmony is their wiſh, founded upon broad benevolence, and a full conviction that the world, large enough for both their objects, " is made for Cæſar and for Titus " too," then undoubtedly it is a logical conclusion, that their choice of Engliſh adminiſtrations could not be *that*, which they accuſe of being barbarous in hoſtility, and treacherous in neutrality. If the directory wiſhes to nouriſh a hatred in the people againſt England, they will be eager for the duration of that miniſtry here, whoſe *very name* will be nutriment to French antipathy; whoſe intrigues will be ſuppoſed to ſtir up every commotion that may ſpring in their new government:—and whoſe political ſway in this country, cannot fail to be the ſource of conſtant jealouſy and endleſs ſuſpicion in that.

An armed truce may ſuit their views of future revenge upon England, but would be a thouſand times more deſtructive to us, than even the war itſelf.—How long we may ſtand the preſent conteſt,

teſt, how ſoon it may bring irretrievable ruin upon us, I do not know—but this is quite clear to me; that, without a *perfect peace*, without a thorough eſtabliſhment of good humour, without a mutual desire to eradicate mutual acrimony, and a common zeal to extinguiſh national ambition, even *the war* is better than ſtopping it, only until France, proverbial in quick recovery from military ravage, ſhould renovate her marine now ſo reduced, (in part by the bravery of our navy, in part by the treaſon of Toulon) and fall upon us with that undivided exertion of all her faculties, which (without the authority of the late Lord Mulgrave, who aſserted its fatality, whenever it happened;) is *ſuch a proſpect*—as I had rather not diſcuſs.

However, without considering farther how far this adminiſtration may be agreeable or ſuitable to France; let us ſee how far they are proper negotiators for England.

EFFECT

EFFECT OF THE MINISTER'S SYSTEM UPON ENGLAND.

In the total incertitude of the true cauſes of this war, its ſupporters have aſſigned as different motives to it, as their intereſt or fancies ſuggeſted. Among many other reaſons it has been called a war to protect the conſtitution againſt French opinions, and to ſuppreſs ſedition. This country, like all countries, contains perhaps ſome diſaffected perſons. Upon the ſurface of ſociety there will always be a floating portion of individuals, without families, fixed reſidence, or occupation, who might rejoice at any confuſion—confuſion being the proper element of their hopes. In England there are ſuch.—There are ſuch in every nation. Here too I am far from diſputing there may be ſome perſons enamoured of French principles and diſpoſed to propagate them.—That any conſiderable number however of the people of England, are diſſatisfied with the ſound liberty of the genuine Engliſh conſtitution is an aſſertion falſified by inquiry, in proportion as the inquiry has been ſtrict and rigorous.

But for the ſake of argument let us admit the libels againſt the people to be true.—In that caſe, the

the man ſhould be ſent to bedlam, who imagines the ſafety of the conſtitution augmented, or the malignants diminiſhed, by the war. The maniacs who engaged in it were importuned in due time, to reflect on the inefficacy of combating opinions with ſteel and gun powder; and ſurely to believe that unexampled defeat abroad has ſtrengthened the conſtitution at home, or that diſcontent has been removed by increasing the cauſe of it, ſuppoſes the human mind to be turned upside down.

The ſtriking features of this adminiſtration form a curious ſubject of obſervation in a variety of views. A good government is demonſtrated in the *prevention* of crimes, a bad one in their *puniſhment*. Let private life be libelled;—inundate the land with a deluge of immorality and perſonal ſcandal! This is nothing—but for political ſpeculations, impriſonment or exile! In contradiction to all reaſon, policy, philoſophy, knowledge of life, and common ſenſe, their never failing ready remedy for every thing which they chooſe to denominate political offence, is *puniſhment*—though the hiſtory of the world cannot furniſh an inſtance where the manners of a country have been altered, or any popular paſſion obliterated, by ſuch a botcher of reformation as *puniſhment*. It would not be eaſy to decide whether huſbandmen and manufacturers decreaſe more rapidly than ſpies and ſoldiers augment. One

portion of the community is hired to beat down the other, and barracks ſpring up like the armed men of Cadmus. The tortoiſe which our miniſterial mathematicians place under our ſyſtem, is a ſtanding army. The war ſecretary threatens "a vi-"gour beyond the law," exults that if "he can-"not make the citizen dumb, he ſhall make the "ſoldier deaf," and almoſt in plain words avows a military government. The Engliſh conſtitution which before reſted upon its own ſublime principles of juſtice and liberty, is now made to lean upon its eternal enemy the ſword. The vulture that gnawed its liver is choſen to feed it. Inſtead of the ſweet delights and wholeſome ecſtacies which the native purity of the Engliſh conſtitution was wont to yield, theſe bawds to its beauty and lovelineſs, patch it up like a painted proſtitute and ſend it forth to deal out diſeaſe and death!

A ſtanding army in time of peace! The law which, in giving it an annual exiſtence, ſets its mark againſt it, will be a reproach to the people; and if the preamble of the mutiny bill is retained, after the eſtabliſhment of the menaced plan of government, it will ſurely be the moſt groſs impoſture ever practiſed upon the underſtanding of a nation!

—There are bodies in matter that cannot incorporate. There are principles in polity that cannot be reconciled. Immortal then be the difference between the perſons who affirm that the true conſti-

tution

tution of England exiſts at this moment, and thoſe who have uniformly oppoſed its innumerable adulterations by the preſent miniſtry, eſpecially the two laws of the laſt year!

It is true the people of England ſtill have the liberty of the preſs and the trial by jury—objects no doubt of the deareſt value, but where is the ſecurity for their permanence? In paſſing the gagging bills of laſt year, the miniſtry confeſsed that thoſe were but part of a ſeries of reſtraints. The rumour was ſtated in the houſe of Commons, that a bill was in reſerve which went to the radical ſubverſion of the freedom of the preſs; and the fact was not denied, though they durſt not venture farther in the ferment of that moment. But who will be bondſman that ſuch a bill ſhall never appear? As to the trial by jury, if we had not ſeen, how that great right of which it is a part, the *habeas corpus*, may be ſuſpended in a few hours, where is the ſecurity that the conditional threat of one of the miniſters, of introducing the whole Scotch law of ſedition, as they already have the principle, into this country, may not expoſe the ſoundeſt friends of the Engliſh conſtitution to the fate of felons?—Or what is to prevent the introduction of the Iriſh treaſon law, which takes the ſubject's life away *there*, upon evidence that could not touch a hair of his head *here*:—Let theſe men go on then until, bill after bill, they make the Engliſh, as deſpotic as the Bourbon

government; will their ſlumbers *then* be more ſerene? When according to this ſhocking progreſs, they ſtill have the full terrors of a baſtile, and of another Broglio, ready to ſlaughter his fellow citizens, will they, even under *ſuch* circumſtances, be at heart's eaſe from the fears that now ſcare them?

—I hope not—and to that divinity who—rejoicing in his welfare, muſt approve his creature's liberty as the beſt baſe of virtue and happineſs, my prayer is—that if they follow the example of the Bourbon tyranny, they may ſhare its fortune!!

With reſpect to French principles, whether they are much diffuſed in England or not, it ſeems almoſt impoſsible to believe that the government ſhould have ever felt any real terror of what they charged upon them. To ſuppoſe that principles, which, according to the repreſentation of their oppugners, inculcate a ſyſtem of robbery, anarchy, plunder, oppreſſion, aſsaſſination and maſsacre ſhould have infected the maſs of the public, is caſting a ſtain upon the Engliſh character, that favours as little of prudence or decorum

decorum as of truth or juſtice. No man *can* believe this, who knows the juſt, the mild, and merciful nature of an Engliſh heart. The inference is then, that if fears are entertained of the general prevalence of new principles among the people of this country, it cannot be upon the ſuppoſition of their being wicked, ferocious, and bloody. It is abſurd to imagine that any ſociety can embrace doctrines, deſtructive of all ſociety: for human fitneſs will be ſure to find its own level.

The greateſt danger to the Engliſh conſtitution is from its pretended conſervators. *Quis cuſtodiet ipſos cuſtodes?* At all events, if diſcontent or political ſpeculations boded peril *before*, it is mere lunacy to ſuppoſe them removed by the war. There is silence indeed, but it is that silence which was truly foreſeen by the petitioners from Southwark againſt the *two bills*. "If "theſe bills," ſaid the petitioners, "ſhould paſs "into law, it is our opinion that a ſullen calm "may for a while ſucceed; but which in the "end may prove more dreadful than all the ſedi- "tions which are ſtated as the cauſe, even ſup- "poſing theſe ſeditions eſtabliſhed by due in- "quiry, which your petitioners conceive is not "the fact. The irritation and violence of a "ſpeaker are apt to evaporate with the oration, "while the oppreſsed mind, brooding over the

"griefs

" griefs it dares not utter, and ſtifling the anguiſh " which conſumes it, is likely to burſt out in " ſome terrible explosion, the effects of which " may be too late for remedy."

The preſent ſtillneſs is more awful than public clamour. The moderate party, who have moſtly confined their efforts to parliament, look with aſtoniſhment at the country, and ſcarcely know what to do for a people who will do ſo little for themſelves.—But in the *extreme reformers* there is a ſecret ſatisfaction, a lurking joy, at every act of the miniſtry; and eſpecially at the duration of the war!*

By

* In the courſe of laſt ſpring, a meeting in Weſtminſter to petition for peace was talked of in ſome newſpapers, though no ſuch meeting was in reality intended; and it was rumoured that a member of conſiderable ſway in the London correſponding ſociety, had abuſed the Duke of Bedford and Mr. Fox for the ſuppoſed intention of convening ſuch meeting. Happening to be acquainted with the gentleman alluded to, and not a little ſurpriſed at the report, I made it my buſineſs, from mere perſonal curioſity, to queſtion him as to the fact. The anſwer I received was literally in theſe words. " I was miſre- " preſented. I caſt no cenſure upon Mr. Fox or the Duke of " Bedford, whom I highly reſpect for their late conduct; but I " certainly regretted the ſuppoſed plan of calling a meeting; " and for this reaſon. I conſider the war ſyſtem as the ruin of the " country; and as I am ſure that the continuance of the pre- " ſent war, will produce ſuch an alteration of our ſyſtem, as " muſt

By the designation of " *extreme reformers*" far from me is the ſlighteſt thought of offence. I have no knowledge of this claſs of politicians, which, as far as it goes, is not in direct contradiction to the faſhionable calumnies. My notion is, that an enlightened being; that any perſon, who founds his claim to the regard of mankind, upon any ſpecies of intellectual diſtinction, *muſt* be an enemy to anarchy, blood and plunder, and a friend to order, humanity and law, as a neceſsary conſequence of the premiſes. It is poſſible that theſe gentlemen have the more correct ideas of political liberty. For myſelf, however, I confeſs, that I have not ſtrength of wing to ſeek the liberty of Engliſhmen beyond the outline of the Engliſh conſtitution. A republic may be the grander inſtitution—but if I were convinced that the republican form was the beſt for every other nation upon earth; ſtill I ſhould feel bound upon my own principles to the ſupport of limited monarchy in this country, which is ſo rootedly attached to that ſyſtem.

Whether it is yet poſſible to animate the inert, and to temper the violent, into that middle courſe, which, avoiding the ſad extremes of deſ-

" muſt make it impoſſible for any corrupt government " ever to wage another, I certainly did diſſuade every perſon that " fell in my way, from attending the projected meeting—for I " do moſt heartily wiſh the duration of the war!!"

potiſm

potiſm and licentiouſneſs, ſtands ſtoutly upon the true principles of the Engliſh conſtitution, *reſolutely determined to reſtore and re-eſtabliſh it*, is very doubtful indeed; but come what come may, whether it ſucceed or fail, in *that courſe*, according to my apprehension, lies the true policy of the people of England!

INCAPACITY OF THE PRESENT MINISTRY TO MAKE A REAL PEACE.

For peace or for war the preſent adminiſtration appears unequal to the exigency. A peace at their hands, in my judgment, will be mockery, —and if the war muſt ſtill go on, we ſhould fight with the whole force of the people, which *they can never wield*. The alarm of invasion is now countenanced by the king in his ſpeech. If there be any real foundation for this fear, why is the country left in the hands of ſuch a miniſtry?

The Engliſh army is undoubtedly brave, as it ever has been. If our troops have not brought their wonted laurels from the continent, it is owing to the deteſtable nature of their miſſion abroad,

abroad, and the wretched government at home, that fruſtrated their efforts, and made their valour drop dead born. But is it an offenſive queſtion to aſk, upon what principle more is to be expected from the Engliſh army, even ſuppoſing every corps in the country down to the city regiments (" that light militia of the lower ſky," which, " prop'd on their bodkin ſpears," have no viſible exiſtence) to be all veterans; than from the experienced legions of the houſe of Auſtria? With all the courage of the French ſoldiery, with all the genius of their generals, it is impoſſible to ſatisfy common ſenſe, that the celerity of their triumphs is not in a conſiderable degree, attributable to the apathy of the inhabitants in the conquered countries.

How came France invincible to the moſt formidable invaſion recorded in hiſtory?—by being an armed people. How is an invaſion from France to be reſiſted?—by an armed people. Why were not Germany and Italy armed then?—the tyrants dared not truſt the people. But why is England, which, as yet, is no tyranny, likened to thoſe countries? No—ſay the miniſtry, the people are armed.—Their own fears betray the falſehood of the aſſertion. They know full well that ſelected factions, accoutred capapee, are not the people. Were the people armed, that ſuſpicious contempt of the enemy, expreſsed

in the king's ſpeech, on which I forbear any ludicrous remark, would be juſt indeed.

Powerful as France is, ſhe will never conquer the armed united people of England—but coming, with all her might, upon a country ſplit into parties and torn by diſcontent; then I ſhould ſay, may God defend us from the defence of Mr. Windham and his "deaf ſoldiers.!"

Were the untried bravery of all theſe corps eſtabliſhed beyond the Roman ſtandard, what an abuſe both of words and things it would be, to call them the people! "But this ſelection is ne-"ceſsary, to keep down the diſaffected—and the "number is fully equal to the danger*" "When "ſubjects are rebellious upon principle, kings "muſt be tyrants by neceſſity."—What ſort of a principle is it that ſtamps a nation rebels? Are Locke and Monteſquieu, are all the patriarchs of freedom to be anathematized, while doctrines of ſervility which the rankeſt toryiſm of all paſt times would reject and ſpurn, are fulminated with Athanasian infallibility, as the true creed for free Engliſhmen?

* The devotion of the armed bodies to the miniſtry is ſtated with triumph, upon the ground of their being for the greater part "*dependant upon the government*"—an affirmation which is ſurely falſe—for if true, it would be ſaying more againſt the Engliſh ſyſtem, than was ever urged, or ever can be urged, by ten thouſand Thomas Paynes!

Ireland,

Ireland, for inſtance, was an armed nation in the late war. Oppreſsed for ages ſhe complained. The man who may yet ſave this country, removed the grievance; and all was quiet in a moment. With that ſkill which diſtinguiſhes ſcience from empyriciſm, he went to the ſource of the evil and accompliſhed the cure in a moment.

Every villainy* was at work againſt that country,

* The hypotheſis ſeems not unreaſonable, (comparing events and individuals, with poſterior circumſtances), that there was an early reſerve in the mind of Mr. Pitt reſpecting the liberty of Ireland. His Mentor, the late Mr. Thomas Pitt, whom he has ſince created Lord Camelford, requeſted that he might be allowed to ſecond Mr. Fox's motion for the repeal of the 6th of George the Firſt. He did ſo; but no two ſpeeches, that agreed in the ſame meaſure, ever differed more in principle, than thoſe of the mover, and ſeconder. Much of the ſtuff which Mr. Pitt let out upon that occaſion, may, I fear be very palateable to many of the governors of Ireland, at this moment; —yet, notwithſtanding the dearth of civil virtue which marks that miſerable country, there is ſtill *one man* (I hope there are many) who will be an impregnable obſtacle to the crooked policy of the common enemies of both nations. With but a ſmall portion of perſonal knowledge I confeſs that I feel an intereſt in the character, as all feel in the conduct of that gentleman; who with an eloquence that ranks him with the brighteſt orators of Rome or London, has (leaving out ſome ſlight ſhades of conduct tinged perhaps with ſome ambiguity) ſuſtained his country's cauſe, with admirable fortitude and conſtancy! If the extreme contempt of the Iriſh for the parliament, ſhould diſpoſe them to an indifference reſpecting public tranſactions; if the growing corruption which debauches away

country, with the ſame cry that is ſo often heard now againſt bodies of men here. " Ireland " means to follow the example of America. " Ireland deſigns to be a republic!"—Be juſt and fear not, anſwered the honeſt miniſter, whoſe ſyſtem is not made up of tricks and devices. In an inſtant the diſcontents of four millions of people were huſhed into harmony; and twenty thouſand ſeamen directly voted for the Engliſh navy. Though the regular force of Ireland was fighting the battles of England in every quarter of the globe, the enemy durſt not land a grenadier in that country—even at the moment that the triumphant fleet of France and Spain had ſcoured the Engliſh channel!

Such was the defence of an armed nation. Mark the ſituation of that country *now*, and behold the difference between a good and a bad adminiſtration!

Divide et impera ſaid the Roman tyrant. As a principle of government, the country is divided into

ſo many friends and aſſociates, ſhould reduce this great man to the individuality of his ſingle exertion; if by the progreſs of profligacy he ſhould be become the only man, with Iriſh blood in his veins, to ſtand up for his country's welfare and honour, I am perſuaded he will think there is more true glory even in ſuch a ſolitary ſtruggle, than in that accumulation of rewards and pageantries, which the deſertion of his duty could not fail to ſhower down upon him—I ſcarcely need add that I mean Mr. GRATTAN.

factions.

factions. Sect cutting the throat of sect. It is not as in 82, when protestant, catholic and presbyterian embraced each other with one heart—a religious persecution desolates the country; and the ministry of Lord Camden (a man of gentle nature but surrendered to the guidance of a greedy grinding cabal) not unlikely to be classed with the rule of Nero, or Dioclesian!!—

I shrink from the further contemplation of this subject.

In England the people must be armed and united, or the country is gone. The plan of deafening the soldier, by immuring him from the citizen (a plan more worthy of a committee from Bedlam sitting in divan at Constantinople, than of an English privy council), must be given up. The people must be united into one body and animated with one soul, an energy and union impossible to be attained by the present administration; whose persecutions have planted an incurable detestation in a very large portion of the community; whose perpetual invasions of the dearest liberties of the people have induced others to consider any success of theirs as triumphs

umphs over the conſtitution; whoſe general miſmanagement and unexampled diſaſters are calculated to unnerve the arm of the country by a natural deſpair of the ſucceſs of any operations planned and directed by ſuch bunglers!

Had the preſent war been, in the court cant, the moſt juſt and neceſsary, ever ſupported by England, inſtead of the direct reverſe of both the one and the other, as I conceive it to be—the national vengeance (if a ſpark of the antient ſpirit of the country remained), had long ſince fallen upon theſe men, whoſe internal ſyſtem is ſo exact a corollary to their foreign.

Of foreign nations the ill will of the greater number is entailed upon us. Accuſed by our late allies of treachery, deſpiſed by the neutral ſtates for the inſolent attempt to force them into the coalition: a deteſtation in ſome, a diſlike in moſt, of the continental powers, prevails againſt this government. Since the league of Cambray, no combination ever diſcloſed ſuch pointed reſentment as the treaty juſt concluded between France and Spain—and never did enmity appear more natural than in one of the parties—of the provocation of the other we are at preſent in the dark. The feelings of the Dutch are perfectly conſentaneous to thoſe of the Spaniſh nation; of which their late proclamation is a doleful, decisive proof.

With regard to the Stadtholder, the moſt deliberate

liberate plot to deſtroy him, root and branch, could not be more effectual than the conduct of miniſtry to that ill-ſtarred prince! Diametrically againſt the opinion of his wiſeſt friends, they originally cozened him into that fatal war, which hurried him almoſt in a moment from the head of one of the gayeſt courts in Europe, to ready furniſhed lodgings in Pall Mall. Coupling the conſtitutional jealouſy of the Stadtholder's power, which has ever prevailed in that country, with the diffuſion of a more enlarged ſpirit of freedom, of late years; his bittereſt foe could not have pointed out a courſe more fatal to his proſpects of reſtoration, than dividing his intereſts from thoſe of the Dutch people, and holding out that *he* was every thing—*they* nothing. His name and authority are ſaid to be proſtituted for the purpoſe of depredation upon his country in every quarter of the globe—and an Engliſh miniſter, with unbluſhing front, avows the deſign of *riding home*, as it were, upon our dear ally—in this reſembling a parcel of ſharpers, who, if ſtrangers fail them, indulge their rapacity upon each other.

" Like pikes lank with hunger, that miſs of their ends,
" They bite their companions, and prey on their friends."

I hope the rumour is falſe that there is nothing ſo little in faſhion here as the unfortunate prince of

of Orange ;—although indeed it is quite natural that he ſhould be hated by thoſe who have ruined him!

Without diſcuſſing the value of the Cape of Good Hope, or anticipating the terms of a treaty, it may be affirmed with truth, that if honour pervaded our councils—or if the moral feeling of the country had not been perverted by maxims of government very new amongſt us, Mr. Dundas had not dared to boaſt that our "indemnity "for the paſt" was to ariſe from the plunder of the very people we had forced into this war; and whoſe ſuppoſed danger made one of the pretences of our firſt engaging in it. The annexation of the Dutch colonies to this empire, ſhould, under the circumſtances of the caſe, if a decent ſenſe of ſhame exiſted, have been declared rather with a ſhew of grief than gladneſs. In the perpetration of ſuch an act, one would have expected, at leaſt, ſome diſcretion of exterior. The hypocrite that bluſhes at his crime is not totally devoid of grace. Moderate knavery has ſometimes an anxiety about reputation—but conſummate turpitude defies appearances. ! !

THE duration of the preſent miniſtry is an anomaly in politics, and why is it ſo?—Why is the ſyſtem of human opinions to be reverſed for ſuch men?—Why is their fortune to have no influence upon their power?—In all the ages of the world, miſcarriage civil, military, and moral, has determined the ſituations of mankind. It is not France;—but let me aſk, what foreign nation is likely to entertain reſpect for a country, whoſe adminiſtration is at once a miſchief to its intereſts and a reproach to its ſpirit.

I ſhould certainly be the firſt to exclaim againſt any external interference in the compoſition of the domeſtic government of this country—holding very cheap indeed, the well known precedents in the preſent reign, of diſplacing and diſavowing miniſters to pleaſe the court of France. It is upon Engliſh principles and for Engliſh conſiderations exclusively, that it behoves the national honour and juſtice, to put ſome brand upon the author of the national misfortunes.

I ſhould not need to ſay, to thoſe who know me, that the laſt thought in my mind would be to affect the life of any thing human. Criminal as I feel the miniſter to be, I ſhould

even expoſe my perſon to ſhield him from popular violence, if any accident put his perſonal ſafety within the protection of ſo powerleſs an individual. God be thanked for it, not one life excepting a government ſpy has been ſacrificed (whatever was intended) in this country for any civil offence; though the perſecutions have undoubtedly been manifold and the puniſhments dreadful. Without ſtriking at his life, there are other modes by which a magnanimous nation may ſet its mark upon a great delinquent, who ſtands in the way of his country's real peace and true ſafety! As it has been the ſtudy, ſo it ſhould be made the crime, of the miniſtry, to have interwoven, as it were, their own deſtiny with that of the conſtitution, and to endeavour to identify themſelves with the eſtabliſhed government of the country. This is the grand grievance reſpecting external relations which *can* be remedied only by their diſgrace; for the *very point* of national ſalvation depends upon a clear diſtinction being made between the people of England and the adminiſtration—between the firſt magiſtrate and his temporary agents! Such a diſtinction clearly aſſerted and the majority of the nation fairly vindicated from the iniquities of this baleful ſyſtem—depreſſed and reduced as the country is, it may yet be redeemed into ſafety and reſtored to honour.

Under ſuch circumſtances an honeſt able miniſter may hold this language to France.

" The people of England acknowledge, and

" never

" never refuſed to acknowledge your republic.
" Free themſelves they never repined at the free-
" dom of other countries. The people of Eng-
" land abhor the deſpotiſm you have overthrown,
" and which was not more oppreſſive to you, than
" miſchievous to themſelves. The king of Eng-
" land, in his electoral capacity, has made peace
" with you, and has ever since maintained his neu-
" trality inviolate. A Britiſh faction with a lodg-
" ed hatred to the ſpirit of liberty, has involved
" their country in a common cauſe with the ty-
" rants that conſpired againſt you. That faction
" is diſavowed and branded. No impediment
" now remains to obſtruct the peace of the two
" countries. Go on and proſper with your repub-
" lic, or with whatever you pleaſe. The people
" of England will never meddle in your domeſtic
" concerns, and is reſolutely determined never to
" admit any interference from you in their con-
" cerns. Let us have ſuch terms as a nation like
" England has a fair right to expect, and we
" will ſhake hands to-morrow.—But if juſtice
" and policy are ſuperſeded by revenge and am-
" bition—if you are reſolved to fight the Engliſh
" nation, on account of the guilt of the miniſter,
" until one of the two countries ſhall be extin-
" guiſhed—if *delenda eſt Carthago* be indeed your
" maxim—then I warn you, that the people of
" England will periſh in their laſt gun-boat, or die in
" the extremeſt ditch of the iſland, rather than owe

" their national independence to the mercy of " any foreign power."

Such language *could not* be fruitleſs, if the French directory are the men they affect to be.

If the directory are indeed the faithful ſervants of their pretended ſyſtem—of a ſyſtem which ſhould ſeek the happineſs rather than the aggrandiſement of the nation—which ſhould unite liberty with ſecurity of property, and equality of civil right with conſtant ſubmiſſion to the law—the free exerciſe of the human intellect both in ſpeech and writing with an immutable adherence to order—whoſe government ſhould be abſolute over the multitude and the individual, but obedient to the nation—" whoſe executive power, poſ- " ſeſſing an uſeful ſplendour, ſhould always awaken " ideas of the grandeur of the ſtate, but never of " the man" whoſe public functions ſhould be acceſsible to every citizen, without permitting any individual, or family, or claſs, to claim peculiar prerogatives or exclusive diſtinctions, always aiming at the preponderance of virtue and genius—a ſyſtem which ſhould oblige the legiſlator and the magiſtrate to return to the condition of a ſimple citizen after a ſhort exerciſe of their authority, without danger of anarchy or peril to public tranquility—whoſe political œconomy ſhould cheriſh every ſpecies of art and induſtry, and ſcrupulouſly exact the due portion of each individual, differing with the difference of his means, to ſupport

port the national exigence, without injuſtice or oppreſſion to any perſon—which ſhould encourage every branch of uſeful labour and the culture of the ſublimeſt ſciences, with equal aſſiduity—which ſhould regard victory only as the means of peace, and prefer the comfort of the citizen to the glory of the general—which ſhould contrive ſuch a modification of man from the cradle to the grave, as to make it not only the duty, but the intereſt, of every creature in a vaſt republic to maintain the ſocial order; and to ſuppreſs that licentiouſneſs and tumult which afflicted and finally deſtroyed the antient democracies!

Whether this picture which I copy from their own drawing ſhall be a mere vision of the imagination, or actually realiſed in the new republic, thoſe who profeſs it as their plan of government, will give the lie in the face of the world to their own principles, if the language I have marked out, ſhould, under the circumſtances recommended, be unavailing. It is not in human ſophiſtry to reconcile the Spaniſh treaty with the profeſsed maxims of the new government, nor is it vindicated upon any general principle. A diſtinct exception is made for the caſe—that is to ſay, for the ſpecial purpoſe of revenging the crimes of the Engliſh government—and if the ſyſtem and the miniſters of the Engliſh government remain unaltered, the probability is, that the treaty juſt concluded

ded with Spain, will ſerve as a *fac ſimile* for many more.

I ſuppoſe we ſhall have ſome virtuous vigorous alliance to oppoſe to this worſe than family compact.—In all probability that of a flagitious tyranny treading under its truly ſwiniſh hoofs one of the nobleſt nations and honeſteſt kings in Chriſtendom—to make an experiment upon Britiſh credulity; and, after mulcting the common bubble of European deſpots, in purſuance of the eſtabliſhed precedents, to carry over perhaps its arms to the enemy?

Or ſhall it be Portugal?—Who ſhall undertake that our faithful Portugal may not exhibit another faithful copy of the contagious integrity of Mr. Pitt's allies?

At all events, whatever ally, and whether any adhere to us, the courſe which I have taken the liberty to ſuggeſt would produce theſe two reſults—it would unite England, and diſunite France. France once convinced of the ſincerity of England, could not endure, after five years geſtation of a war, ſtrictly *pro aris et focis* on her part, to give her enemy that ſacred advantage over her, the value of which ſhe ſo well knows. The preſumption is that the people would force their government, if it is really diſinclined, to moderation. On the other hand the Engliſh nation, ſatisfied of the fallacy and ambition of the French ſyſtem, would be animated by one ſenſation in ſuch circumſtances;

cumſtances; and high as France ſtands, let even France look to it,—when ſhe compels the people of this country into a perſuaſion, that, inſtead of aſſiſting, as heretofore, the tyrants of Pilnitz, they are now fighting for *their all.*

It is obvious that this language cannot be held by the preſent miniſter;—nor by any other, while this ruinous junto is allowed the capacity, by a new back-ſtairs intrigue, of repractiſing upon both England and France the deſtructive ſchemes of the laſt six years.

The conduct of one part of the cabinet is indeed a matter of juſt wonder. Speculation is confounded at the ſupineneſs of the Duke of Portland and Lord Spencer!—whoſe motives at leaſt, however fatally they have erred, no candid perſon will be eager to ſuſpect.

I ſhould bluſh to make even the moſt diſtant charge of unworthy motives upon the Duke of Portland, whom I muſt ever regard with the warmeſt affection.—It is ſaid that French principles inculcate an oblivion of all friendſhip and obligation. I hope there are no ſuch principles French or Engliſh in the world—at all events I diſclaim them.—If the horrible calumny caſt upon Condorcet in reſpect to M. de la Rochefoucault were in any part of it true, I ſhould ſay that it was the ſignal juſtice of heaven that drove Condorcet from human haunts, and made his abandoned body the food of rats and ravens—inſtead

of

of being, what I am perſuaded he was in fact, the victim of Roberſpierre's villainy!

Though no living creature can deplore more than I do, the late politics of the Duke of Portland, never did I doubt that it was "only in a general "honeſt thought" he became one of this unhappy government; but his native candour muſt ſhew him, under what diſadvantages, even he, ſo comparatively innocent, muſt treat with the French. The French know the Duke of Portland's ſituation as well as the Engliſh. They know full well, that he has departed from the tie of a long life of private friendſhip cemented by the pureſt public principle and left "the nobleſt man in "all the world" for the purpoſe of combining with men, whoſe political crimes he has reſiſted with ſo much honour to himſelf; whoſe riſe to power he has ſo ſpecifically ſtigmatiſed, as ſubverting the fundamental principles of the conſtitution; whoſe ſubſequent meaſures he considered as draining, day after day, the life blood of Britiſh freedom! and whom it is probable he would be obliged, like Lord Faulkland,* to attack the moment after he had contributed to their victory

* Lord Faulkland was a friend to liberty. He heſitated much before he joined the King againſt the parliament; dreading the triumph of the royal party. Though he accepted the office of Secretary of State, he feared that the King's conduct, in the event of ſucceſs, would compel him to take part againſt him.

—and

—and all this for the purpoſe of carrying conflagration into France, and annihilating the revolution in that country.

By that virtue which I know to be in him, and which, though his new aſsociates may cloud it, nothing can extinguiſh, I aſk the Duke of Portland, whether he does not think that the preſent adminiſtration treats with France under difficulties that augur ruin to the country, and that no other body of Engliſh politicians labours under? Does his Grace think that Lord North (notwithſtanding his private merits) would have been the fitteſt negotiator with America? The Duke of Portland ſcorns, I am ſure of it, the power and emolument of his office as motives to public conduct;—I conjure him then by his undoubted love for his country, to relinquiſh a vain project the purſuit of which has produced ſo many calamities; and consign to Mr. Windham the practical paradox of ſupporting Mr. Pitt "on account of his crimes."

Mr. Windham! However unpleaſant it is to uſe ſharp language reſpecting a gentleman whom one has highly reſpected, it is impoſſible to deny that his conduct is the moſt pure and net apoſtacy that can be imagined. His friend Doctor Johnſon need not be conſulted, for the whole of his own miniſterial life illuſtrates the word beyond the definition of philology. Embracing his new faith with a zeal beyond its firſt profeſsors, and ſtig-

matizing his ancient friends and principles with rancour ſurpaſſing the bitterneſs of a common enemy, no ſycophant from Sir Robert Filmer to Mr. Reeves, ever broached doctrines more directly tending to unqualified deſpotiſm, than this former advocate of the liberties of mankind! Of him it may be truly ſaid, that court favor has dropt upon him like vitriol, and "turned his "whole mind."

Never was conviction more luminous upon the mind of man than that which I feel, that neither England or France can ever enjoy tranquility within, or real peace without, while the power to plague them is in the hands or within the reach of the common diſturbers of both countries.

As to principles! it is evident that if the miniſtry adhered to principles, no treaty with the republic is even *poſſible*. Without entering into the queſtion between them and Mr. Burke, it is demonſtrable, even before his work appears, that he and Lord Fitzwilliam have at leaſt the credit of conſiſtency.—And did the late lord lieutenant of Ireland (the honeſteſt and wiſeſt that ever preſided in that country) doubt, that his quondam colleagues would play him another ſlippery trick? Did he indeed think that *their* principles in the cruſade, would weigh againſt their places? Did Lord Fitzwilliam forget the ſtomach that digeſted the ſolemn vote of a Ruſſian war, one day as *ſine qua non* of Britiſh ſafety, and as ſolemn a

dereliction

dereliction of it the day after? An ignominious oblivion of all principle upon this point, ſtares upon the face of all their late meaſures and miſſions;—and who that considered their character, ever doubted they would *treat*, if the nation would ſuffer it?

But what ſort of treaty? I think I might defy the underſtanding of man to comprehend any ſyſtem of intercourſe, which (reaſoning upon common ſenſe) the preſent miniſtry *can* eſtabliſh with France, that muſt not be a ſort of *bellum in pace*, a mitigated warfare in the midſt of peace.

For the ſake of argument however let us grant that the French is perfectly diſpoſed to truſt the Engliſh adminiſtration. Let us ſuppoſe the latter to have renounced every ſentiment they have ever uttered reſpecting the former—as they muſt do in the event of any treaty. Let us ſuppoſe that ſuch recantation ſatisfies the directory; and that of all Engliſhmen the largeſt conceſſions will be made to Mr. Pitt. Admitting all this to be true, in contradiction almoſt to certainty, ſtill for *Engliſh reaſons only*, the life of this miniſtry even in caſe of peace—is death to the country.

The noble earl, before alluded to, demanded of miniſtry in the laſt ſeſſion, whether they were prepared for the emigrations, and the conſequent importation of French principles which may follow a peace.—I hazard but little in aſsuring that reſpectable nobleman, whoſe own conduct has

greatly conduced to the evil he dreads, that it will not be ſo much an emigration, as a flight to France. A flight of whole bodies of people,—of thouſands of families, and perhaps millions of individuals, in caſe the ſyſtem of the miniſtry prevails. The difference between three thouſand miles, and three and twenty miles, is great indeed—and yet the man who thinks that the emigrations to America, in the laſt four years, are not hurtful to this country, muſt be a driveller!

If the French government proceed with the ſame moderation, and regard to property that have marked their career ſince the eſtabliſhment of the new conſtitution, the ranks of every claſs in this country (placemen alone excepted) muſt be visibly thinned by this ſecond going forth of the Iſraelites. The probability is, that the country will be decimated by emigrations, unleſs it is freed from that bondage, which diſguſts perhaps more than it oppreſses a true Engliſh ſpirit.

Would the noble Earl know how to guard againſt French principles, the true defence is Britiſh freedom. Let Britiſh freedom be broad, and ſound, and firm, French theories oppoſed to it, will be "like ſparrow ſhot againſt a baſtion." Let him reſtore the Engliſh conſtitution in its genuine purity, and the noble Lord may reſt upon his coronet, in ſecure defiance of French principles and propagandiſts! There is a ſufficient

love

love of his native ſoil planted in the breaſt of every Briton, to make England the land of his choice, if a benignant government ſhall embrace its whole people without diſtinction of religion or ſect—and ſhall preſent as a front to the paper liberty of France, for as yet it is not much more, the ſterling breaſt-work of true old Engliſh freedom.

What ſort of a government is that which ſhall make peace with an enemy only to contend with its own people?! Let any man read the late laws againſt liberty, obſerve the barracks, liſten to their own ſyſtem propounded by their own lips, and then judge for himſelf, of the probable ſtate of this country under a peace negotiated by the preſent miniſtry.

In considering a peace eſtabliſhment, I would rather addreſs myſelf to the ſordidneſs than the patriotiſm of a great portion of the public. I bluſh to think that the number is not ſmall of thoſe, who have an utter diſregard to liberty; and with whom the barometer of every good under heaven is the ſtate of the 3 per cents. What the finance ſcheme of the miniſtry for the next year is, I know not—whether as rumour ſtates, a forced loan, a limited poll tax, or any other project, which according to cuſtom they have condemned in the French and copied after.—This however is clear, that unleſs the income is made to quadrate with the expence, there is no talking

at

at all of reſources. Of all modes of increaſing the public means, the ſureſt is the retrenchment of eſtabliſhments—words which muſt be blotted out of the code of our domeſtic œconomy.

Here let me call to mind the plan of our enemies. In the late meſsage from the French directory to the war miniſter they thus expreſs themſelves. "It is the intention of the directory, that from this moment all the territory of the republic, comprising in it the countries united to it, be put upon the eſtabliſhment of the moſt profound peace; that the number of troops in the republic be reduced to the ſimple garriſons of the fortreſſes; that the ſervice of the interior be performed ſolely by the national gendarmerie and the ſedentary national guards. It is the intention of the directory, that even the ſlighteſt veſtige of military regime ſhall be effaced—that the conſtitutional order ſhall be uniform throughout the whole extent of the republic, and that the citizens ſhall approximate by the cares of agriculture, the relations of commerce and the love of the arts."

—In full belief that the preſent miniſtry if their power continues, will force us into a fixed national ſtruggle with France; the ultimate ruin of England may be truly feared from the principle that dictated a meaſure ſo auſpicious to France in the two grand points of liberty and œconomy, as the meſsage I have juſt quoted: when

when ſet againſt our plan of barracks, and of tranſforming the brave citizen ſoldiers of once free England, into a horde of Janiſſaries, contemptible for the firſt time to their enemies; and terrible only to their unarmed countrymen!

Let not the ſlighteſt veſtige of military regime remain, ſays the president of the French directory. Up with the barracks—cries the Engliſh war miniſter. "If we cannot make the people dumb, "we can make the army deaf." O! ſhocking contraſt! How diſmal a proſpect for this country! how brilliant for its enemies! The power that relies upon force, leaves little doubt of its character. It is the grand land mark in polical ſcience, that diſtinguiſhes a free government from tyranny. Civil authority loſes its name when ſuſtained only by brutal ſtrength; indifferent in which ſhape it appears, that of a ragged rabble, or of a band of myrmidons cropped in one faſhion;—inſtruments alike deteſtable, whether the watch-words are liberty and equality, or church and king!!

Can any doubt then exiſt that the war, though ruinous, is better than peace from ſuch men? It is an abuſe of the term if it ſhall not give two things—firſt, a reaſonable hope of union and ſatisfaction among ourſelves;—ſecondly, ſuch a reſtoration of real good humour with France, as may bury the paſt in oblivion and furniſh a fair hope of future amity; or, to repeat once more

the

the phraſe of the miniſter upon a former occaſion, " to ſhew the world that France and Eng-" land were deſigned for other purpoſes than " mutual ſlaughter"—two *great bleſſings* which I conceive to be morally, I had almoſt added, phyſically impoſſible from Mr. Pitt and his aſſociates.

IS A REAL PEACE PROBABLE FROM A CHANGE OF SYSTEM, AND NEW MINISTERS?

Can any miniſter do this great work? Is it poſſible for any man to bring all the diſcordance of this empire into one ſtream of harmony? Where is he to be found, who can furniſh a proſpect of ſuch a peace, as may become us to accept, and give at the ſame time a reaſonable ſecurity againſt French ambition—or failing in that attempt, who ſhall ſo wield the ſtrength of England as to defy the utmoſt power of France?

The man muſt be " ſent from God" who can undertake for the certainty of ſuch effects; for no agent, merely mortal, can promiſe it.

But without pretending to infallibility—men ſtill remain among us, whoſe virtues forbid a total deſpair of the public weal.

Here

Here let me anticipate a ſort of anſwer, if it deſerves that name, which is ſure to be urged againſt this pamphlet—that its purpoſe is to pull down one miniſter only to put up another;—a ſtile of argument much practiſed by the miniſterialiſts of late; who, from a conſcience of what its fate ought to be, have made laboured efforts to prolong the credit of this wretched adminiſtration, by degrading the motives of its opponents into a mere love of loaves and fiſhes.—Depravity would level all things to its own ſtandard.

To call this conduct by its proper name, reſort muſt be had to coarſe epithets—It is a *villainous* and an *impudent* trick, and not the leſs ſo, for being very common and vulgar.

Without dwelling upon the miſery of begging queſtions in this way, and of replying to arguments, only by the imputations of motives; *villainy* alone can tell the people of England that they have nothing for it but to go on in the ſame courſe of ſtupid confidence in the ſame men, who have brought the empire to its preſent pitch—and it is ſure *impudence*, emboſsed and burniſhed, to charge the ſtateſman who will be juſtly ſuppoſed the firſt in my contemplation as the ſucceſsor of Mr. Pitt, with any ſordid ſentiment.

A man whoſe indifference about office is proverbial; whoſe whole life is a demonſtration of the moſt incorruptible integrity—whoſe ſoul was never ſtained with the ſlighteſt tinge of avarice,

and whoſe glory it is, to have lived in the conſtant diſfavour of a court, the fatal politics of which have brought on the greateſt evils which any nation, that ever ſurvived its misfortunes, has ſuffered—the whole, both in groſs and detail, in diametrical oppoſition to the advice, and confirming with moſt extraordinary minuteneſs, the reiterated but fruitleſs predictions of this very perſon!

The perturbed ſpirits of the miniſter's minions may reſt aſsured, that Mr. Fox will never be the favourite of ſuch a court. His Majeſty, well read, I doubt not, in *Horace* and *Father Boſſu*, makes a moſt poetical uſe of this gentleman. Epic writers never introduce a divinity, but when the object is unaccompliſhable by human power.

"*Nec Deus interſit, niſi dignus vindice nodus.*"

Is it deſigned as the higheſt flattery, that the king never calls in the aid of Mr. Fox but when it is *dignus vindice nodus* with national affairs?—that is to ſay—when they are in the laſt extremity—and the government becomes a kind of forlorn hope?

In theſe circumſtances ſtood the country when Mr. Fox firſt became miniſter—One Engliſh army had ſucceeded to the captivity of another Engliſh army, paſſing *ſub jugo* from Saratoga to York town. The connection with Ireland wholly depended

pended upon the bare diſcretion of an armed country; inſulted, wronged, and reſting upon her firelocks. The navy of France, Spain and Holland chaſed the Engliſh fleet into Portſmouth; another hundred million was added to the national debt, and the 3 per cents. were at 57.

In theſe circumſtances Mr. Fox was called upon; and if the reader have any curioſity to know how ſoon the call ſhall be repeated; I will tell him to an exactneſs. When the likeneſs to the above picture is quite complete, we ſhall ſee a tardy, mortified, languid, reluctant compliance with the public voice in his favour, *and not one hour before!*

The two epochs differ in one reſpect. At preſent our navy has the ſame ſuperiority which it maintained during the greater part of the American war; and therefore it is probable that until Admiral Richery, or ſome other French ſailor, ſhall renew the triumph of M. de la Motte Piquet in 82—Mr. Fox will have full leiſure to ſhoot partridges.

Of Lord Spencer's talents, I certainly make no queſtion; but even Lord Spencer cannot boaſt more zeal or experience than Lord Sandwich: from whoſe cloſet iſsued that dictum of French ſuperiority " whenever her navy became her ſole " care" already referred to, as coming from a late noble ſea officer, who at the time he delivered

the opinion, was himſelf a commiſſioner of the admiralty!

It is not, God knows, from anxiety that Mr. Fox ſhould be miniſter, either on his account or from views perſonal to myſelf, that I have taken the trouble of composing this work. If I were of a corrupt nature, little as I am, the channel had been long ago open to me and upon more than one occasion. In his day of difficulty or danger I believe I ſhould be found as near to Mr. Fox and cling as cloſe to him, as any perſon born of woman;—but my diſposition does not particularly lead me to cultivate any body in the hour of ſucceſs. I ſuſpect that I ſhould not be the firſt to preſent myſelf upon his kiſſing the king's hand—no evil to the man I love beſt, for in ſuch a caſe he would be ſure of a crowded levee. My true motive is the ſalvation of my country, and without dwelling longer upon malice which perhaps ſhould be treated only with contempt and ſcorn—I proceed.

The beſt chance then of real peace with France is ſurely from this deſcription of miniſter.

From a miniſter, who, bred in the principles of the grand alliance and nurtured in a fear of French power, had ſurveyed the revolution in France as the harbinger of peace to England and to Europe—who, burning with the ardor of a patriot for the freedom of his own country, beheld the rising liberty of other nations with the rapture

ture of a philoſopher—who was the firſt public man in Europe to hail the downfall of the atrocious deſpotiſm of the court of Verſailles—who lamented as heartily as the enemies of the French revolution rejoiced, in the crimes and cruelties which were not ſo much produced by that event, as by the unprincipled combination formed againſt it by foreign tyrants—who, gifted with an underſtanding like intuition to ſee in the right ſeaſon the wiſdom or folly of ſtate meaſures, had warned his country of the fatal policy of its miniſters towards France, and oppoſed this deſtructive war in all its ſtages, with invincible conſtancy and courage; though deſerted by thoſe who were neareſt his heart, and ſupported only by a few firm aſſociates, whoſe merit is increaſed by the ſmallneſs of their numbers, and the general delirium which the adminiſtration had ſo artfully excited—a man whoſe morals prevent him from exulting at the misfortunes of others, and whoſe manners ſecure him from the neceſſity of humiliation.—Who never inſulted France in the period of her depreſſion and has nothing to diſavow or expiate in the hour of her triumph—who has not left mankind in the dark about his object for four fatal years of unexampled carnage—and finally, whoſe diſtinguiſhing character being directneſs and plain dealing, appears the propereſt man to negotiate with a people who affect to ſubſtitute candour for the fineſſe and fallacy of courts!

Such

Such a man, though the deſperate circumſtances in which the country is plunged, forbid the hope of ſuch treaties as England has been accuſtomed to, may obtain ſome endurable terms;—and he may do, what is of ten thouſand times more value: he may extinguiſh national hatred.—He may reſtore that mutual confidence between the two nations, without which any peace will be delusion. —But rather than Mr. Fox ſhould diſgrace himſelf with any participation in the deſtructive projects of the preſent miniſtry (a ſpeculation which the court cant has of late very aſſiduouſly inculcated) I had rather behold him ſepulchred in that mute ſcene where Cato repoſes, defeated indeed in his noble designs, but conſecrated by unſullied honour to the admiration of after ages!

If this country is fated to contend with France upon the principle of the *delenda eſt Carthago*; (which I truſt in God is not the fact) if probity and openneſs fail of all effect upon the government of France; this country has nothing for it, but A FINAL COURAGE worthy of its ancient character, and ſuitable to its tremendous danger. Then muſt be rouſed thoſe Engliſh energies, which Mr. Windham,* with ſuch mortification and venom,

* This miniſter after likening France to Pandemonium and the French to devils, in the true ſpirit of the Quiberon ſtate-paper, panegyriſed the national energy they had diſplayed in the

nom, abuſed the people of England for not diſplaying in ſupport of this odious war—energies impoſſible to be excited by the preſent miniſtry—but which Mr. Fox may yet call forth!

It may be aſked with good reaſon, whether thoſe inveterate friends of the war, who are ſo implacable for its duration in the confidence of its working the downfal of the monarchic and ariſtocratical parts of this conſtitution, are likely to be ſubdued into concord and co-operation by a better adminiſtration? A direct "yes!" to ſuch a queſtion would be too much to anſwer for—but when the cauſes, heavy and grievous of their preſent diſcontents, are taken away; when the Engliſh conſtitution is reſtored to them, ſound, pure, and vigorous; their ill humour, to which Mr. Pitt furniſhes ſuch conſtant aliment, will ſhew itſelf with an ill grace, and the conclusion is reaſonable, —that after full juſtice is done to the country, the number of ſuch perſons will be few, their efforts feeble, and that they will ſoon melt into the common current of Britiſh feeling.

the war, with a ſore ſarcaſm upon the Engliſh, for the want of it.

"No, ſo God help me, they ſpake not a word,
"But, like dumb ſtatues, or unbreathing ſtones,
"Star'd at each other, and look'd deadly pale."

Buckingham's account of the people, to Richard the III.

There

There is another claſs, which may not be unworthy of conſideration, in the event of a new government. Thoſe whom Tacitus has well deſcribed, marked by their propenſity to ſervitude; —tyrants at once and ſlaves, who think they gain ſomething by every abridgment of Britiſh liberty and ſuffer by every acceſſion to it. Theſe, ſome of them perhaps with arms in their hands, might be reckoned cold colleagues in a truly popular ſtruggle—Cold enough I doubt not,—but their natural antipathy to the French revolution, would at leaſt be an aſsurance of their fidelity in a conteſt with France,—and, for their utility in the hour of need, of all the deſcriptions among us, the atchievements of theſe gentlemen ſhould be the laſt thing to be thought of.!!

Such perſons will be more formidable to the government of an honeſt miniſter in time of peace, than in time of war to a foreign enemy; for it will ever be found that the worſt defenders of a free country are thoſe who love its freedom leaſt. Theſe boiſterous revilers of the French are diſtinguiſhed enough for the glory of holiday ſoldierſhip. To judge by their lofty contempt, each of them " would kill you ſome six or ſeven do-
" zen Frenchmen at a breakfaſt, waſh his hands
" and ſay"

" *Fie upon this quiet life! We want work.*"

SHAKESPEARE.

But

But ſpecious profeſsors are ſlippery performers—and vaunting pretenders to vaſt exploits, commonly end like their great prototype, in being planet-ſtruck! Never was ridicule more juſt than that which is levelled at what are called "lives "and fortune men"—The ſteady tenor of true courage diſdains the diſcuſſion of its proweſs, and if the French ſhould ever invade this country, I have no doubt that thoſe will *do the moſt* againſt them, who *talk the leaſt* upon the ſubject.

Upon the whole unleſs I have deceived myſelf, the premiſes are well laid whereon I build this conclusion—that this country has every thing to dread from the preſent adminiſtration, and every thing to hope from its opponents!

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

HAVING expreſsed with great poſitiveneſs, a total deſpair of the public ſafety under this ill-omened miniſtry, it is natural to consider whether there ſeems any probability of better auſpices, by putting the nation into the management of better men.

My opinion is that there is not the ſlighteſt likelihood of ſuch an event. As to the parliament's

ment's compelling it—the thing is totally out of the queſtion. Jealouſy of the power of the crown! ſuſpicion of the miniſter! a vigilant ſuperintendance of executive government! theſe words are only known as hiſtorical terms that apply to paſt times. To grant money and praiſe the miniſter is all that is now even looked for.

A member* of the houſe of commons a few days before the late diſſolution, in a ſpeech of exquisite clearneſs and beauty, made a ſolemn charge upon adminiſtration of having *conſciouſly broken* ſeveral ſtatute laws—and the reſult, though it has not excited the leaſt impreſſion in our time, cannot fail to be the wonder of poſterity, if the principles of the Engliſh conſtitution ſhould ever again reanimate the morbid maſs of the Engliſh people. The accuſation was met by a direct *confeſſion of the facts*—and what is the judgment of the judges?—*complete indemnity!!* This incident, a drop of water in an ocean of similar acts by the ſame body, is mentioned only, as it happens to be an epitome of the conduct of that houſe, from its birth to its expiration.—No man waſtes time ſo much as to ſpeculate upon the ſyſtem of the new parliament, ſo abſolute is the certainty of its independence and public ſpirit!!

It has been the aſtoniſhment of wiſe men how this country ſhould have been ſo eager, after

* Mr. Grey.

the

the American war, to engage in the preſent, which is full brother to it; and the fact ſerves to confirm the philoſopher's opinion, who ſaid, "that experience had little effect upon mankind." The American war was a project to cruſh the ſpirit of liberty, as well as the preſent war; and the clamour of late years againſt French principles has not been more vehement, than the war-whoop which had been howled through this country againſt the ſedition, anarchy, and rebellion of the Americans. Like cauſes will ever produce like effects. Where ſelfiſh pride and jealous tyranny take poſſeſſion of men's minds, the freedom of the human race, wherever it is cultivated, is ſure to excite their malignity, in deſpite of example, however forcible, or of experiment, however recent and afflicting.

One of the moſt furious ſupporters of the preſent war, the image indeed of many others in the ſame reſpect, is Mr. Powis. This gentleman vindicated for a long time the American war, with the ſame phlegm he now diſplays againſt France.—He lived, however, to ſhed, even on the floor of the houſe of commons, ſalt tears of ſorrow and remorſe—but alas—they were

"The tears forgot as ſoon as ſhed!"

Oblivious of paſt penitence he relapſes into the ſame courſe; and though no man accuſed Lord

North with ſuch aſperity " for deceiving the " country gentlemen into the American war," as he expreſsed himſelf—Yet Mr. Pitt finds this identical ſenator a ſort of parliamentary pioneer in the French cruſade.

Leaving thoſe then, if there are any, to the fruition of their reveries, who expect that the parliament will pull down this baneful ſyſtem, the next conſideration is whether the nation will aſsert itſelf, to ſave itſelf.

In the firſt place, can the nation ſpeak at all? If it can, is it inclined to ſpeak? There are thouſands in this country, in the ſituation of Juſtice Woodcock; who, piqued at his ſiſter's ſhrewdneſs in diſcovering the impoſture of his daughter's lover, embraces the ſuppoſed impoſtor, as a means of obviating the ſiſter's triumph. " Brother, brother," ſays Deborah Woodcock. " the fellow's a vagabond!" " So much the bet- " ter," anſwers the juſtice, " I'd have him a va- " gabond." John Bull knows well enough that he has been gulled all through the war; but, with his characteriſtic ſimplicity, he prefers being duped by the miniſtry, to the acknowledgment of being outwitted by the ſuperior ſagacity of thoſe who warned him of his danger.

Between the conviction of ſin and the ſhame of confeſſion—I take this to be the preciſe feeling of a great part of this country. Combining this ſentiment with the known ſtate of things in this country—

country—with that leviathan, the influence of the crown (ſufficient of itſelf to weigh down any ſpirit of the people, even when the popular tide flowed moſt rapidly againſt the court) and ſuperadded to that political liſtleſsneſs into which the Engliſh nation has notoriouſly fallen of late years; the luxury of the higher, the poverty of the lower orders; the apathy of all to all things but animal enjoyments—fate cannot ſhake a favourite miniſter in ſuch a country, unleſs

"He take great pains, and work againſt his fortune."

If it be a patriot maxim not to deſpair of the common wealth, no nation under heaven has put its patriots to ſo bitter a teſt, as England has done during the preſent war. Even at this moment, the moſt fantaſtical thoughts are encouraged in conſequence of the retreat of the French armies in Germany.

It has been well obſerved that ſuch exultation is the ſtrongeſt proof of the diſgraceful war the country has carried on. It is indeed without intending it, the higheſt ſtile of compliment to the arms of France!—That the collected efforts of the houſe of Auſtria, after long meditation of the attempt by their own account, and as a ſort of *dernier coup* to ſave the ſeat of empire, ſhould have driven back the French armies towards the Rhine!—that this ſhould excite ſuch tranſports in the allies,

in

in total forgetfulneſs of all the paſt, as well as of the true ſtate of things at preſent, is like the joy of the unhappy wretch, who having loſt his legs and arms, rejoiced that the head remained upon his diſmembered trunk.

Why?—if General Jourdan's army had been forced back into the heart of the Hundſruck,—if General Moreau had been at this hour at Straſbourg—if General Buonaparte had remained at Nice—where he was on the 11th of laſt April, in the place of having impounded the King of Sardinia in his abridged dominions; of having driven before him the veteran bands and moſt renowned commanders of the Emperor, from the plains of Cheraſco to the mountains of Trent and of having brought all Italy to his feet—in fine, if France had been quieſcent during this campaign, and had remained only as ſhe ſtood at the cloſe of the laſt, then—even with *that* comparative littleneſs of her acquisition; ſhe would ſtill have waged the moſt ſucceſsful war that ever nation waged before her. Her conqueſts, during the previous four years, ſurpaſs thoſe of Rome for the four firſt centuries of that common wealth; and the new republic will be found to have fought more battles in that time, taken more fortreſſes, gained more victories, and ſubdued more ſtates than the antient all-conquering republic ever did in equal length of time, not excluding any period of Roman renown.!

Is

Is this ſtatement an expreſſion of joy at French ſucceſs!?—How drunk with delusion muſt this country be—how many degrees beyond intellectual ſanity, if it cannot bear the relation of hiſtorical fact! I have the authority of all philoſophy at my side in aſserting that hatred of another nation is not the teſt of regard for one's own. No error is more common in England than miſtaking a luſt of the good things of government for love of the conſtitution; and confounding an abhorrence of France with true patriotiſm. The baſeſt communities deteſt their enemies the moſt. Noble nations reſpect, and ſavage tribes devour, each other. The Archduke Charles, becauſe he has the ſoul of a hero, holds his antagoniſt in high eſteem; and if it could be known which of that brave prince's followers, deteſts the French with moſt rancour, it would infallibly turn out to be the dirtieſt fellow in his army!

In the words of old Caratach—

"Allow an enemy both weight and worth."

And I repeat it, ſo far from being prompted to the fatal purſuit of this war, by the retreat of General Jourdan—when that general's army has again its head-quarters at Treves; when Moreau has meaſured back his two hundred miles to Straſbourg: and when Italy is as perfectly reconquered, as it is conquered now, then, *even then*,

then, our motives to triumph will be exactly this; —we ſhall be as near the attainment of our undefined object in this war, as we were—six months ago!!

The appetite of many people in this country to traduce the French annihilates all memory as well as judgment.

In the number of its blind cenſures, who could believe that the advocates of the Engliſh miniſtry ſhould venture to taunt the French directory, for inſiſting on the Duke of Brunſwick's diſmiſſing the perſonage called Lewis XVIII. from his dominions. I feel for that unhappy prince, *becauſe he is unhappy*; and honour the Duke of Brunſwick (the beſt and mildeſt ſovereign in Europe, however he may have ſuffered by the odious ſervice of the allies) for the aſylum he would have granted to the unfortunate. But this feeling is without ſurpriſe or cenſure of the French. I can neither forget that England had a Pretender, nor its conduct upon a like occaſion.

So high was the popular indignation at Paris in the year 51, againſt the Engliſh government for what was thought an unneceſsary perſecution of another Pretender in thoſe days, that Lewis XV, in the plenitude of his power, found it prudent to conceal the peremptory demand of the court of England, until after he had privately arreſted and baniſhed from France that miſerable fugitive,

at

:t a time when his whole army conſiſted of his valet de chambre.—How different from the ſituation of a perſon in whoſe cauſe two of the greateſt potentates of Europe and all his own nobility are openly in arms.

No country on earth is ſo prodigal of its condemnation as England, for practices that ſhould whiſper us *to look at home*. Very ſeemly and becoming indeed is the flippancy of Engliſh reprobation for the attacks of the French government upon the emigrants property. England! that exerciſed the wideſt ſyſtem of confiſcation, recorded in latter ages, for acts which were the eſsence of civil virtue, in compariſon to the conduct of the French emigrants.

The Iriſh deemed James II. their lawful king. (The full half of England thought ſo at the ſame time.) They fought with him at home. They followed his fortunes abroad. They never visited their country with invasion or rebellion after their departure; and yet their innocent poſterity were cut off from all poſſibility of ſucceſſion by one ſtroke of ſweeping oppreſſion!—whereas the French emigrants (their creed the Duke of Brunſwick's manifeſto) carried fire and ſword into the heart of their country, for the avowed purpoſe of re-eſtabliſhing the ancient deſpotiſm; and did this too in direct diſobedience of the formal prohibition of Lewis XVI. himſelf!

It is not with pleaſure that I recur to thoſe tranſactions. I wiſh they were blotted from the page of hiſtory—and effaced from the memory of mankind. My nature leads me much more to pity the French emigrants than to aggravate their ſufferings;—but the cant of Britiſh reproach for French forfeitures, is ſo very *very groſs*, that it appeared to me a duty to notice it, in a publication, the drift of which is to annihilate animosity between the two ſtates—as the greateſt good that I am capable of rendering to my country.!!

Should the extinction of that animosity be found indeed impoſſible;—then is my conviction quite positive, that England will gain a loſs, though peace were signed to-morrow; and though the French directory ſhould deſcend from its relative altitude, to concede terms to this country, beyond the hope of the moſt ſanguine Engliſhman!

To cloſe this laſt clauſe of my ſubject—I can perceive nothing in the conduct of the government, or the complexion of the nation, to furniſh any expectation of a change from that ſyſtem againſt which every day in the laſt four years bears ſuch decisive teſtimony. The country ſeems devoted. It is remarked of men, and of nations, who have ſeen better times that in the midſt of adverſity, they retain the habits of their former fortune.

tune. When the Roman empire was reduced to the circle of Trebiſond, the deſpiſed inhabitants of that miſerable diſtrict, ſpoke as lofty a language as the cotemporaries of Scipio or Caſar. Degraded as this country is in the face of ſurrounding ſtates, its miniſter aſsumed an arrogance in the debate upon the addreſs, on the sixth inſtant, as high and haughty, as could have become that brilliant period of its military ſplendour, when the Duke of Marlborough was at Bouchain, and Lewis XIV. ſelling his jewels to the Jews of Amſterdam.

Indeed the whole conduct of this gentleman in the diſcuſſion of the sixth, was extraordinary—even in him.

It is a maxim in morals that he who gives all, gives leaſt; and in logic, that he who proves too much, proves nothing. Though the markets for Britiſh trade, enumerated in a previous part of this pamphlet are inconteſtibly gone; though every neceſsary of life is dearer by one third than in the commencement of this war; though the trading intereſt barely floats, by dint of the moſt extreme exertion of pecuniary artifices; though the government pays 14 per cent. for money; though this miniſter himſelf is ſaid to deſpair of ſupplying the public neceſſities any longer by the uſual mode of loans and funding. Yet even *he*, ſo remarkable for captivating pictures of national ſucceſs, never drew ſo gaudy a

portrait of the wealth of the ſtate and the ſecurdity of its reſources, as at that moment—*at the very moment* when he announced a meaſure of government—which is an implied contradiction of his own magnificent repreſentation.

It is one of the moſt ſtriking features of Mr. Pitt, that he never abandons a favourite purſuit, without giving a thouſand reaſons againſt his own determination.

If this country is in the ſtate he affirms it to be, why, (to quote himſelf again) does he "ſup-"plicate France" *more at this time*, than at any period of the laſt four years?

If the commerce and revenue are as he deſcribes them, why deſert the uſual courſe of loans and funding?

His anſwer to the firſt was indeed *ſui generis*. Studious ſo to poſt himſelf in the parliamentary battle as to avoid their contact who could tread him under foot, he manœuvred ſo as to be his own catechiſer; and diſmiſsed all inquiry into his imperious refuſal to negotiate at any previous juncture of the war, with this ſyllogiſm. "Does it "follow that we ſhould not treat with France "now, becauſe we have not treated before"—Such is the anſwer of this worthy gentleman, after a ſacrifice without example of Britiſh money, blood and honour.!

No words but his own could convey an idea of the variegated abundance, and unprecedented

fortune

ſortune of this flouriſhing country at this hour! It was ſure enough, " the miraculous draught of " fiſhes."

" One fault he has, I freely will reveal:
" Could you o'erlook but that—it is to ſteal."

He is the fineſt painter in the world,—ſave one point. The immortal pencil of Sir Joſhua Reynolds was a daubing bruſh to his tongue, in every thing except *likeneſs*.—But it ſo happened that if he had not in the courſe of diſtributing his colours, very often mentioned " *this country*," it never could have occurred to his hearers, feeling and ſeeing, what they ſee and feel, that he meant " *England*." Indeed he reſembled another ſort of painter,—who having drawn the portrait of a clock, inſcribed the name of the article on the top leſt the identity ſhould not ſtrike the connoiſſeur.

Mr. Pitt did much more upon that day. The Lord Mayor's intelligencer down the river, never went beyond killing off thirty thouſand of Jourdan's troops—but the drawcansir of the houſe of Commons demoliſhed both the French armies *in toto*.*

And

* If no other communication exiſted, but the government gazette of this country, we ſhould be as ignorant of the true ſtate of Europe, as the inhabitants of Laputa. For example. The King congratulated the parliament laſt year upon the ſafety of Italy—and this country paid two hundred thouſand

And his luck is like magic.! It was not until *the day after*, that the official report of the directory came, ſtating to thoſe upon whom a fiction upon ſuch a ſubject could not impoſe for many hours —that the entire loſs of Jourdan's army was ſhort of *ſix* thouſand, and the defalcation ſupplied by *ſixteen* thouſand.!!

However all this cannot be for nothing.!

"Our Pitt does never lie, but for good cauſe."

ſand pounds every year of the war towards that object. The flower of the troops of our ally the Emperor and one of his moſt renowned Captains have been ſent to reſcue that country; —and yet to this hour, the four following lines are all the intelligence we have from the London Gazette. After a grand deſcription of General Wurmſer's atchievements in the beginning of Auguſt, it adds—"During this movement of the Field "Marſhal, the enemy attacked in great force on the high "ground; and ſome of the battalions of the right wing having "given way, fell in with thoſe of the left wing not yet poſted. "This unfortunately created confuſion and obliged the Field "Marſhal to retreat on this place."

Such is the ſum total, upon the authority of the London Gazette, of our knowledge of the utter ruin of our cauſe in that country;—though we have had a regular miniſter, a very reſpectable gentleman incapable of falſehood or mutilation, Colonel Graham, ſtationed with the army of Marſhal Wurmſer.

—After all, I believe thoſe underſtand the people beſt, who treat them in this manner.

His

His imagination could never have taken ſuch flights but for ſome grand object. I believe he has two objects; and time will pronounce upon my conjecture. I gueſs firſt that he has ſome very fine ſcheme indeed, for raising money; and ſecondly, I gueſs that the war is to go on.

If he can contrive that Lord Malmſbury ſhall tranſmit ſome extravagant condition of the French directory, ſo as to ſeduce from his opponents in the houſe of commons *any thing* by which he may vamp up the unanimity ſo much prayed for by his diſciples; I do not ſee why we may not protract the bleſſings of this auſpicious contention, until Lord Fitzwilliam and Mr. Burke themſelves, ſhould call in the dogs of war. The *proema* of ſuch a *denouement* was very ſkilfully laid upon this occaſion. He insinuated his plot with the art of a maſter—The piece went off like other farces.—*Valet res ludicra*—and truly enough I may ſay, *Suique plauſu gaudet theatri.* He was charmed with the applauſe of his own fair and candid audience.—

From Sylla to Roberſpierre, from Jack of Leyden to Mr. Brothers; no ſucceſsful villainy or fortunate fraud, that either terrified the timid or deceived the ignorant for a ſhort time, and finiſhed in the indignation or contempt of the world, ever had its day with more flaſh, than the affair of the ſixth inſtant.!

Our

Our miniſters have often talked of the triumph of acquitted felons; and I dare ſay have no conception of the triumph of convicted criminals. No ghoſt however needs come out of the grave to point out ſuch criminals: convicted, not by the verdict of any formal judicature, but by a tribunal more awful and unerring—by the growing miſeries of millions,! by the waſte of incalculable treaſures! by the ſlaughter of many hundred thouſands of God's creatures! by the deſolation of provinces! by the ruin of realms! and by the curſes, " not loud but deep" of all rational, feeling and unbiaſsed beings!!

CONCLUSION.

This pamphlet has branched out far beyond its original outline. The difficulty in diſcuſſing the miſconduct of the adminiſtration, lay only in my limiting myſelf to a single part of it. Fruitful theme for obſervation! as their government is in a variety of other reſpects, I have digreſsed as little, I think, as poſſible from that grand feature of it, their policy with regard to the French revolution, and this fatal war, which was an inevitable

table conſequence of that policy. There is an eternal fidelity in principles. Civil government is a great machine, and when the grand ſpring is falſe, every other movement is confuſed and irregular. The government began this buſineſs in the wrong, and can never finiſh it in the right.

In commenting upon their conduct, I have not hinted a single ſyllable againſt their private lives. With that freedom which the ſubject requires, which ſprings from the vital eſsence of the Engliſh conſtitution, I have uſed, and I hope not abuſed, the right ſtill remaining to us, of ſcrutinizing a great meaſure of the reſponsible ſervants of the crown and the people. Their perſonal characters may be among the moſt amiable in the world; and I doubt not they are ſuch. I meddle with nothing but their public political acts, in which every member of the community has a high intereſt. The ermine does not adorn any miniſter of the law, who holds perſonal detraction and private calumny in more deteſtation than the writer of this work.

With reſpect to its compoſition, I do not know ſo little of authorſhip, as to urge any thing in palliation of critical defects. When a book is once public it muſt fight its own way, without the aid of excuſes. It *is* however the truth, that theſe ſheets have been put together with an expedition that afforded no leiſure for thoſe ornaments,

ments, which add to the force of ſound reaſoning—and often reconcile that which is weak. I felt the ſubject ſtrongly; and had no other conſideration but that of impreſſing the ſame conviction upon my reader, with little attention to literary decorations.

CRAVEN-STREET,
October the 17th, 1796.

FINIS.